

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1865.

---

- ART. I.—1. *The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel, and other portions of Holy Scripture: with a correction of Profane and an Adjustment of Sacred Chronology.* By W. R. A. BOYLE, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister. Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, London.
2. *Daniel the Prophet. Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford; with Copious Notes.* By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. London and Oxford: J. H. and J. Parker; Rivingtons. 1864.

GREAT and manifold are the sorrows of the Church of God. But of all her chastisements there is perhaps none more fraught with bitter consequences than this: that heresy and schism prevent her giving a devout and concentrated attention to the study of the Prophetic Scriptures. Before her lies the roll containing the yet unaccomplished oracles of God; from which she may come in time 'to understand by books' the number of the years of her visitation. But she must fight and build: and she has no strength beside to break the seals, and meditate on a future teeming with revelations. And thus the powers of the world to come fail to touch and tell upon her. She sinks gradually more and more under the influence of her secular condition, practically wrought upon, not by longing for the appearance and coming of the Son of Man, but by the assurance of the world, 'To-morrow shall be as this day and much more abundant.' The earnest expectation of Jesus has ceased to be felt and acted on. The Church is no longer Israel on the ever-memorable night waiting for the divine command to march out of Egypt. She is no longer the Church of Zion escaping in the twilight from the doomed city through the mysteriously-abandoned lines of Cestius: or, to advert to a well-known incident far lower down in her history, she is no longer in breathless agony waiting for the moment of judg-

ment, as at the completion of the thousandth, or one thousand and thirty-third year after Christ, when Christendom was led to expect, by an erroneous rendering of the Apocalypse, the immediate manifestation of the great enemy of the Lord Jesus, and the consequent consummation. In the practical faith of her several component parts she is coming behind in this gift; she is not a studious expectant of the fulness of the dispensation of the ages. She no longer consciously embodies or gives utterance to the *ἀποκατάστασις τῆς κτίσεως*. This unconscious abandonment of the expression of her supreme hope has exposed the whole Scripture, but the Apocalyptic part of the Old Testament above all the rest, to the insidious attacks of open foes or of those who, unhappily for themselves, profess to walk with us in the house of God as friends. It was when Diocletian was celebrating in Spain his imaginary triumph over the Eternal Name, and when the Church was passing through one of her most searching ordeals, that Malchus, whose surname is Porphyry—apostate Jew, if not apostate Christian—a man whose genius wrung praise from Eusebius and S. Augustine, directed all the forces of a brilliant and cultivated intellect to destroy the authenticity and genuineness of the Book of Daniel.<sup>1</sup> The Church of God is even now passing through an ordeal which, unmarked indeed by the accident of physical distress, is all the more calamitous and injurious. At a time when the whole Scriptures are being brought into question, and the faith and judgment of all the centuries of Christendom are dealt with as delusive, the Porphyrians of our day—without the genius, the manliness, and the unquestionable sincerity of their founder—while they profess to be Christians, and arrogate to themselves the privileges of believers, have cast Daniel again into the den of lions. After 1400 years, the speculations of Porphyry were revived by the infidel Collins. The present-day disciples of the infidel and apostate have learned nothing, have forgotten nothing. Utterly barren in inventiveness, they can do little more than repeat the well weighed but long exploded formulas of their chief. The precious fancy, referred to in a recent number of this review,<sup>2</sup> that the Song of Songs was composed for the guidance and education of Jewish women, seems of close kin to the notion that Daniel was written to console Judah under the persecutions inflicted by Antiochus Epiphanes. We have at

<sup>1</sup> In his work, *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν*, in fifteen books. The most celebrated of these were the twelfth and thirteenth books, in which he attacked the Book of Daniel. The whole has perished. But S. Jerome, in his Commentary on Daniel, has preserved the more important part of the criticisms on that Book.

<sup>2</sup> No. CXXIII., p. 45.



least a definite issue presented to us. *Enlightened criticism assumes the existence of a Daniel no one ever heard of before, to disprove the existence of a Daniel known to history; a critic-made Daniel, who contradicts those very Scriptures which he is affirmed to have known, and which he ought to have studied well in order to perfect his forgery.* Truly is it well said, there is nothing impossible for unbelief to believe except what God reveals. This issue involves, in the words of Bunsen, some of the 'highest triumphs and most saving facts of the more recent criticism.' Whatever the triumphs and the facts acquired may be, we protest against their being designated as the results of the more recent criticism. It is as old as Porphyry.

But it is not only a record, historical and prophetic, that is brought in question, which professing Christians are endeavouring to discredit and expunge from the Bible; it is an obvious truth that the book of Daniel is more interwoven with the history of Redemption than any other portion of the Old Testament, not excepting the Psalms. Who are the Wise Men of the East but the descendants of that mystic school over which Daniel once presided? Where did God teach His people to look for that *Kingdom* which the Baptist announced, which the Lord unfolded, which His prayer teaches every Christian yet to pray for? The title of Messiah, the name of Son of God, the name of Son of Man, are authenticated by the Book of Daniel. The generation to whom the Lord Jesus came in the flesh had been taught by Daniel to expect that the coming of Messiah would be with 'a sign from,' that is 'in the clouds of heaven.' And the Lord, refusing it to them then, promises it to them thereafter. The anointing, death, and glory of the Holy One; the destruction of the nation, polity, and religion of the Jews; the resurrection and the judgment, are the burden of Daniel.<sup>1</sup> Then there is the whole revelation of the personal

<sup>1</sup> The reader may wish to be reminded that the LXX. Daniel was put aside by Jews and Christians, and the version of Theodotion adopted in its room. Theodotion was an unbeliever, living in the first century. The LXX. Daniel was discovered some years since. What led Jew and Christian to discard it was, no doubt, its general inaccuracy. The Jews must have been offended by the gloss 'of years' added to the prophecy of 'seventy weeks,' for they fixed the date of Messiah absolutely. See chapter xi. The LXX. commenting rather than translating, for 'ships shall come from Chittim,' read 'the Romans shall come,' the very words of Caiaphas. These glosses help us to understand how these prophecies were read in the times of the Apostles. In the article on Daniel, in 'Smith's Dictionary,' the writer observes, on the relationship between the writings of Daniel and S. John, 'without an inspired type it is difficult to conceive how the later writings could have been framed.' We are growing daily more and more familiar with this otiose, but yet semiscceptical kind of remark. How about Daniel, who certainly is unique and without any antecedent type? To us it seems axiomatically true and pious to say, and simply presumptuous and irreverent not to say, that the Almighty Inspirer could have enabled S. John to write

enemy of the Lord Jesus, the Antichrist. If the contents of the Book of Daniel be not diviner than the visions of Emanuel Swedenborg, nor truer and more honest than the revelations of the Book of Mormon, how shall we disentangle it from the Gospel History, into which it is so largely taken up? Sceptic as he was as to the authorship of the first half of Daniel, Sir Isaac Newton has not overstated the value of the remainder when he says, 'to reject his prophecies would be to undermine the Christian Religion, which is all but founded on his prophecies respecting Christ.'

Disbelief prepared the way for that feeble and barren criticism which concludes that the book of Daniel is a forgery; a forgery immeasurably blasphemous in itself, and horrible to the thoughts of every honest Jew; yet this notwithstanding, a forgery so wondrously prosperous, that for nearly five hundred years it escaped detection; a forgery that even now, since its supposed perpetration 164 B.C. after 2028 years remains undemonstrated, if we are to judge by the endlessly conflicting and mutually destructive theories of its advocates; a forgery which moulded the ideas of God's chosen people for nearly two centuries; gave form and alarming distinctness to the political fears of heathendom—witness the well-known admissions of Suetonius and Tacitus—and anticipated and popularized some of the very choicest mysteries of the Gospel. It surely is not too much to say that the Pseudo-Daniel, this creation of our critical Frankensteins, out-miracles all that faith believes of God's greatly beloved seer.

In one important respect Porphyry has been distanced by his modern representatives. The thesis which Porphyry, according to S. Jerome,<sup>1</sup> proposed to himself to maintain was this, that Daniel enters so minutely into details that he must be regarded as having written history, not prophecy. Therefore the whole prophetic subject is to be contracted within the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. There is no *arrière pensée* in the pupil of Plotinus. He did not believe, it is true, in either Moses or Christ. But, unlike his successors, he believed in a God who *could*, he held, reveal Himself. Our modern Porphyrians think of the Deity as the Epicureans did of old. The '*securum agere ævum*' is the motto of a Creator who will not, or who cannot, or whom His creatures will not allow to, disturb the inviolable processes of a God-subduing necessity. It was

---

as he has written, or more, had the earlier prophets never penned a line. The writer supposes that Daniel wrote two separate books, which, by the Authorized revisionists, were united and formed into the present book. We see no fair grounds for such a theory.

<sup>1</sup> Proem to Daniel.

reserved for professing Christians to deny 'the pure miracle of supernatural inspiration.' The school of Porphyry is as much inferior in moral character to its founder, as it is posterior in time. Porphyry, as an infidel, may have been ignorant of the divine words, 'the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him, even that prophet shall die.' (Deut. xviii. 20.) It was of such a prophet, as Christians now represent him, neither sent nor spoken to, a prophet of *lies* (Jer. xiv. 14)—it was of such the Incarnate Lord said, 'Daniel the Prophet!' The Saviour an accomplice! 'involving Himself in the innocent fraud!'<sup>1</sup>

Before proceeding with the discussion of the whole subject, we must bestow a short notice on the two works whose titles are prefixed to this paper. And to enable our readers the more readily to take in the whole critical history, we have subjoined in the next page a table presenting some of the more marked results of the criticism of the Book of Daniel. To a table of Dr. Pusey's (p. 215) we have added a few additional particulars. It is the vaunt of Mr. Jowett, that 'Among German commentators, there is, for the first time in the history of the world, an approach to agreement and certainty.' (Essays and Reviews, p. 240). Mr. Jowett is no doubt a learned man, and deeply read in the history of all letters in general, and of the criticism of letters in particular. But if his studies have found no nearer approach to exegetical harmony than what is shown to the reader in this note, we can only say so much the worse for the literature and the criticism. As far as our knowledge reaches, the critical history of the 'Amber Witch' presents, properly speaking, the first instance in the history of modern letters of anything like a consensus among German critics. Our readers will remember that on that subject they agreed in the wrong; and, like the English at Waterloo, who did not know they were beaten, they would not be convinced that their ingenious compatriot had fooled them, and that they had befooled themselves. But the transcendental school having surrendered itself to the conviction that 'all is everything and everything is naught,' that 'mind and matter,' as Miss Codger says, 'glide swift into the vortex of immensity,' and consequently being unable on this side or that of the waves of time to find a spot for thought to rest upon, or where reason might exercise itself, must be pardoned its inability to distinguish irreconcilable contradictions from a remarkable 'agreement:' or, in the awful words of Him who condemns all debauchery of the intellect, to know light from darkness or bitter from sweet.

---

<sup>1</sup> Renan, p. 237.

[illegible]

The work of Mr. Boyle, of Lincoln's Inn, inscribed to Baron Westbury, is no doubt a well-intentioned and conscientious work. He is not happy in his method of designating the language in which the first part of the Book of Daniel is written. He speaks of the proper Chaldee as 'of the Shemitic family'<sup>1</sup> (p. 9). There can be no doubt that the Chaldean immigrants, who in prehistoric times dislodged from the regions north of the Persian Gulf the Shemitic tribes, were of Hamitic or Seythic origin, and came from the south, probably Ethiopia. Hamitic dialects (it was these races invented the cuneiform character) can be traced on rock inscriptions in Persia, as far as Lake Van. With the rise of the Assyrian power, thirteen hundred years before Christ, the Shemitic races appear to have recovered their original status in the low lands, while the mountain fastnesses of the north country continued to be occupied by that courageous people the Chaldeans of prophecy, who, at the bidding of the Most High, were to issue forth burdened with 'evil,' and a great destruction' for his unfaithful people (Jer. iv. 6).<sup>2</sup> That Daniel used the language of diplomatic life so long as he had a Babylonian amanuensis, and that when he was transferred to Susa he was forced to resume the use of Hebrew, is a wholly gratuitous assumption, fails to account for the use of Hebrew in the first chapter, and, falling into the same mistake as Josephus (Antiq. XI. x. 7), confounds a visional with a personal presence in the capital of Cyrus. Mr. Boyle is an advocate for the year-day theory of interpretation. He calls our attention (p. 173) to the fact that the description of Roman power under the fourth beast does not suit the Maccabean age, at which theologians would fix it, because the Roman power had not then 'devoured the whole earth,' and broken it in pieces; what we ask Mr. Boyle is, Had the Roman power fulfilled this condition when the Redeemer was born? Assuredly not. Nay, more, the crowning victory over God's disinherited people was still in the future. We respectfully enter our protest against the inspiration of the book of Daniel being made to rest on the appositeness of historical and prophetic coincidences. No exposition *short of divine*, however venerable by its antiquity, however commended by its wide-spread acceptance, can be admitted in evidence on this point. To concede this would be in effect to concede everything. Mr. Boyle censures (p. 229) Mr. Barnes for differing 'from the two Newtons, Mr. Elliott, and other eminent men,' in referring the little horn (of Daniel viii., it would have been as well if Mr. Boyle had specified this reference, as there

<sup>1</sup> A more accurate designation would be Shemitico-Cushite. None of the proper names are Shemitic.

<sup>2</sup> Loftus, 'Chaldaea and Susiana.'

are two little horns) to Antiochus Epiphanes. We have no interest in maintaining Mr. Barnes and his historical inaccuracies; but in applying the 'little horn' of chapter viii. to Antiochus, Mr. Barnes is upheld by the oldest, as well as the most approved of modern commentators; as, for instance, by S. Jerome and Lowth. Mr. Boyle contends that this '*little horn*' was fulfilled in the Romans. He argues the point with considerable skill; and he certainly seems to establish a case for such an *application* of the symbol. But when he says (p. 345) 'In destroying Jerusalem and massacring the people of Israel, the Romans did 'but exalt their own false religion and "cast down the truth to the ground,"' he does not exhibit much acumen, theological or legal. One would suppose a prophetic 'king' must needs be at least the head of the state with which he is connected; and we are at a loss to conceive how Mr. Boyle can fancy he can discover the lineaments of 'the king of fierce countenance' in those two servants of Rome—in the upright, stainless, and unimpassioned Pompey, or in him whose claim to the title 'Delight of the Human Race,' a sceptical posterity has failed to disprove. Mr. Boyle thinks (p. 361) that the words 'broken without hand' (Dan. viii. 25) are applicable to the death of Julian, who perished from the wound of a Persian javelin. He would have hesitated as to this conclusion, we think, had he consented to compare the death of the last heathen emperor with that of Antiochus, whose fearful visitation is accurately described in the death of Herod Agrippa I. The impotency of the Apostate would never have been so evident had he died any other way. It would seem as if a more immediate visitation would have dignified in some measure the meanness of his blasphemy. The 'shortness' of the sufferings under Antiochus which would lead others to regard the persecutions by the Syrian king as certainly within the scope, though possibly it might not be the fulfilment, of the prophecy, induces Mr. Boyle to form exactly the opposite conclusion. The most elaborate and learned part of Mr. Boyle's work is contained in Book IV. chap. iv. where he undertakes 'a correction of profane and an adjustment of sacred chronology,' in connexion with the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

Dr. Pusey's nine lectures on 'Daniel the Prophet' form in truth a monumental work, which will vindicate the integrity of God's Book, and the industry and honour of the theological school of the empire. He has entered the most trying lists, and he shows that there is no legitimate weapon he cannot use. He is as cunning of fence as he is vigorous and irresistible in attack. A sustained enthusiasm, beautiful to witness in the writer, and delicious for the reader to share, breathes throughout the whole, gives buoyancy to the prodigious accumulations of



learned reference, and sometimes wears the semblance of humour, when with courteous and exhaustive minuteness he shows up the ignorance of our pretentious sciolists. The following will illustrate our meaning in this statement. Dr. Pusey, in a note Preface, p. xiv.), observes :—

‘Dr. Davidson (ii. 338) says, “the word Massa is not a proper name, because ‘Lemuel, King of Massa’ is *not* Hebrew. To make it good Hebrew, *king* should have the article prefixed.” Were there even any such place as ‘Massa,’ any one knows that what Dr. D. says is *not* Hebrew is Hebrew, and that what he says would “make it good Hebrew,” is not Hebrew. As matter of history, Dr. D. tells us, “it is incorrect to say, as Hengstenberg and many others have done, that the series of the opponents to the authenticity of the Book of Daniel was opened by Porphyry in the third century. *Porphyry was not the first impugner of Daniel.* Hippolytus, a Roman Bishop, and orthodox Christian writer, also referred the book to the Maccabæan period and Antiochus Epiphanes, as we know from his explanation of his book, partly Greek and partly Syriac.” S. Hippolytus an impugner of Daniel!’

The preface touches slightly on the controversies of the time. The writer points out how the ancient exposition of the opening verses of Genesis, the accurate rendering of the ‘lights’ that rule, the announcements that the stars were before the earth was made, that the creative powers of the Almighty, ‘who worketh hitherto,’ have never been suspended—how all these facts meet and answer all the demands and discoveries of physical science. Then he proceeds :—

‘The cosmogonies of the ancients were pantheistic, atheistic, or, at best, developments of pre-existent matter. Over and against all these Moses enumerated, as simple and undemonstrated, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Men ask us to account for those thousands of years which geology claims, as if our faith were to depend on *our* knowing the answer. Faith asks them in return how they account for the fact, that through Moses that truth of the creation was made known which human reason cannot explain, which even now it relegates as far back as it can, in order to prevent the dread reality of its Personal Creator from pressing so closely upon it, while yet it is constrained to acknowledge the fact of the creation.’—Pp. xxiv.

It has been, he tells us, the deep conviction of his soul for some thirty years that ‘no book can be written in behalf of the Bible like the Bible itself.’ Where the fact of an objective revelation is denied, where it is maintained that there ‘cannot be supernatural prophecy,’ it is evidently vain to answer objections to the written word. ‘While I have conscientiously ‘read everything which has been written against the book of ‘Daniel, and have met every argument in those writings, my *own* ‘conviction is that the point really at issue remains when they ‘are answered. For the real objection is, that God should reveal ‘Himself to His creature man in any other way than by the ‘operation of man’s natural reason, or that He should tell man ‘anything “beyond the grasp of eye or hand.”’ (xiii. xiv.)



The first question of all, as it is regarded by the critics, touches the structure and the language of the Book of Daniel. Let us dwell a little upon it. The work was written in Asia, a fact of great hermeneutical importance, which has been almost invariably disregarded by the expositors of the prophecy. There are two parts which overlap one another. In the earlier part you are carried forward as far as the reign of Cyrus; in the latter part you are carried back to the reign of Belshazzar. The anticipations at the opening of what is to come, the allusions in the close to what has been recorded, demonstrate the unity of the book. The earlier part is historical and actual—a record for the heathen world, and written in its dialect; the later part is personal and prophetic. Chap. i. to ii. 4 is written in the sacred language, and forms a kind of preface. The Syriac, or diplomatic language, commences at ii. v. 4, and is continued down to the end of the seventh chapter. The remaining five chapters are in Hebrew, as pure and more severe than that of Ezekiel. The subject matter is varied with great art—visions and judgments, and manifestations of the power of God, succeeding one another in order. The vision of the dream-image is followed by the Divine manifestation in the furnace. Nebuchadnezzar's own dream is followed by his punishment. The vision of the man's hand at the idol feast by the punishment of Belshazzar. The blasphemous assumption of Darius by the deliverance of Daniel. The seventh chapter—the first section of the prophetic part, the last of the first division—is written in Aramaic, and argues the unity of the book as well as the unity of the author, and it may be said that the theory of more than one author has been abandoned in despair. Ezra includes in the book that bears his name a state paper in Aramaic. The Aramaic of Daniel presents some Aryan terms: and it is incumbent on our modern Porphyrians to explain how a Jew living B.C. 163 could be familiar with Aryan designations for officers and offices dead and gone four hundred years. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra—the earliest document in the Scribe is six years later than the Prophet's—have only a dialectic difference, and both differ very markedly from the Aramaic of the Targums, which are of the date of the Pseudo-Daniel. The differences between Daniel and Ezra are such as preclude the idea of imitation. It is argued in 'Essays and Reviews' (p. 76) that the use of *Macedonian*<sup>1</sup> words, such as *symphonia*

<sup>1</sup> In his anxiety to disprove the authenticity and inspiration of the Book of Daniel, Dr. Rowland Williams terms *symphonia* and *psanterion* (!) not Greek but *Macedonian* words. He intimates that there are several such words, since he gives these two by way of example only. His language is, 'not only Macedonian words, such as *symphonia* and *psanterion* (!), but the texture of the Chaldee, with such

and *psanterion* (Dr. Rowland Williams alone has the credit of this astonishing discovery) argues the lateness of the writing of the book. When it is remembered that Babylon, the metropolis of the world, must, as such, have received into herself the products and usages of all nations; that the Orontes did not yet flow into the Tiber, but that all currents from the east and west flowed into the Euphrates, it cannot but seem a very Quixotic piece of literary chivalry to conclude a forgery from the appearance in a work professing to be written at and in the language of Babylon, some few foreign words. Indian names were current in Jerusalem under Solomon. Commerce with Phœnicia, or the conflicts of Sennacherib with the Greeks, beside many other means, might have introduced foreign musical instruments into Babylon before the days of Nebuchadnezzar. Dr. Williams says that *pesanterin* is a version of *ψαλτήριον*, a *Macedonian instrument*, which the Macedonians, interchanging λ and ν, pronounced *ψαντήριον*. But *ψαλτήριον* occurs in the LXX. and other Greek versions of the Scriptures, and in classic authors, while *ψαντήριον* is never met. Of Macedonian instruments and music we know exactly nothing; they were never heard of till the creative fancy of Dr. Williams added one more to the five recognised Grecian moods; and as we have no proof whatever that the Macedonians did interchange λ and ν, the result is that we have, as it is well stated, 'an imaginary dialectic variation to account for an imaginary Greek word.'

Græcisms in Daniel have been created by the critics, and abandoned by all but that forlorn hope of his school, Dr. Williams. Rabbinisms were also invented by Bertholdt, and silently put aside. They were in the end as quietly dropped, as in the outset they were audaciously put forth. Bertholdt then

'Appealed to his own critical tact that the Hebrew of Daniel must be two centuries later than Ezekiel, Jeremiah, or such Psalms as were written during or soon after the Captivity. He himself, he says, "could not support this by proof in that place without taking up the room required for other more necessary investigation."

'late forms, &c. remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book.' Essays and Reviews, p. 76. Yet this hardy assertion proceeds from the same pen which had just before written, 'How unlike is English to Welsh and Greek to Sanscrit, yet all indubitably of one family of languages! What years were required to create the existing divergence of members of this family!' Dr. Rowland Williams thus clearly evinces his knowledge of the affinities between the Greek and Eastern languages. When, therefore, he affirmed the existence of *Macedonian* words in the Book of Daniel, as if this were an established fact, he must have known that he had no authority for the allegation, except, in the case of one of these words, an innuendo of Gesenius, which, in another part of the same work, is contradicted by Gesenius himself. As regards the other, no Hebrew scholar ever dreamt of asserting a *Macedonian* origin; and Meier, one of the best of his own school, declares that it is unquestionably Shemitic. Boyle, 55 n.

'It were an easy but unsatisfactory way, simply to show that the words alleged by Von Lengerke [as proving the Hebrew of Daniel to be of a later date] as far as they prove anything, coincide with the age and circumstances of Daniel. This, however, would only have been an answer to the individual. I have, therefore, expressly examined with this object, every notable word and idiom used in the Hebrew of Daniel, and have set down under four heads—1. What is peculiar to Daniel; 2. What he has in common with the middle period of language (*i.e.* words or idioms not occurring in the Pentateuch, but received in books free from the influence of Aramaic;) 3. What Daniel has in common with the later writers (*i.e.* words or idioms which, in our remaining Hebrew, do not occur before the time bordering on the Captivity, or Jeremiah); 4. What, like other of the sacred writers of the same date, he has revived out of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch. The inquiry was simply historical, *where* any words or idioms employed by Daniel occurred in previous or contemporary Hebrew. There is, for the most part, little characteristic in any of this language. In very many words or idioms which do not occur at any earlier date, there is no reason from the nature of the language why they should not. The unchanging East has not our variation of language. The inhabitants of Mecca still speak, in its purity, that same Arabic in which the Koran was written twelve centuries ago. What is characteristic, however, falls in with the time of Daniel.'—Pp. 25, 36.

Daniel freely moulds his language for himself, like all Scripture writers, availing himself of the writings of his predecessors. His style varies as he employs the simple narrative, or soars in prayer and thanksgiving, or transcribes the vision, or sets down a 'condensed descriptive prophecy,' like chap. xi. With the exception of the one naturalized word, *pathbag* (or 'royal meats'), the Aryan words are confined to his *narrative*. The statement of De Wette, accepted too readily by Mr. Boyle (28), that Aramaic is a *patois*, is a mere assertion. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is the Aramaic of Babylonia; that of Jonathan and Onkelos is the Aramaic of Palestine. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is virtually identical. The question is whether these writers are to be regarded as contemporaries, or as separated by a gap of 370 years. We have said that the Aramaic of these two writers is virtually identical. The variations are such as preclude the idea of imitation. A false Daniel would never have been content to half-copy the idiom of a writer whom it was his interest to counterfeit wholly. It has been demonstrated<sup>1</sup> that all the differences between the scriptural Aramaic and that of the Targum are traceable to the Aramaic of the period. That the book is written in both languages suits the times and position of Daniel, and cannot be explained by those who refer it to the age of the Maccabees.

<sup>1</sup> 'It has been alleged by the Essayist that in the Aramaic of Daniel the "A" had "passed into the N" in both "*den*" *this* and "*illen*" *these*, and that this "change is" "an evidence of later language." The major premias must be that "it is known" that in Daniel's time they had not so passed." The A does not pass into the N at all; N is not one of those letters into which A ever passes' (p. 53).

'No other book, or portion of a book, of the canon approximate to that date. The last book, Nehemiah, was finished two and a half centuries before, viz. about B.C. 410.'

Not the least important part of Dr. Pusey's book are the appendixes. The first is a note from Professor Max Müller, on the Aryanisms of Daniel. The last is on a very different subject, the 'secular predictions which Dr. Stanley parallels, 'in regard to exactness of fulfilment, with those of the Old Testament;' and in this note, which is very well worth reading, Dr. Stanley sustains that exposure which every one deserves who mixes up his prose with poetry, and draws upon his fancy both for his faith and for his facts. The fifth note is on the wilful variations of the LXX.; the second, third, and fourth are on the language of the Book of Daniel—its Hebrew, Aryan, and Chaldee characteristics. They are all exhaustive. At the commencement of the first of these, B, the writer points out *what the argument of the critics required, and what they have offered.* Their argument required them to prove, for the demonstration of the later date, that the *style of the book was different in character from those written soon after the Captivity;* while the evidence chiefly brought forward is that *it has certain words in common with them!* Daniel revives idioms out of the Pentateuch, as does Ezekiel; and in many other respects he agrees with Ezekiel. Therefore—oh highest triumph and most saving fact of our recent criticism—Daniel is 400 years later than Ezekiel!

Let us proceed to consider the historical contents of the book:—

The royal boy-exile Daniel was received into the university<sup>2</sup> of the Chaldees when fourteen years of age. During those years he declined feasting on the idol-meats of the palace; and his three years' training completed, he entered on that career of public life which we can trace down to the third year of Cyrus (B.C. 534). How long he survived that date we know not. As Achilles opens and Alexander closes<sup>3</sup> the history of Grecian chivalry, so Joseph opens and Daniel closes the history of God's revelations to heathendom. The rabbinical tradition that he

<sup>1</sup> Mr. McGill's Essay, 'The Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra,' *Journal of Sacred Literature*, January, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> At Warka and Borsippus the Chaldeans had schools for the study of astronomy, a knowledge of which science they would seem to have brought from Egypt, to which country it was most probably communicated by Abraham at the time of his visit there. Genesis xii. According to Berosus, there existed at Babylon, in the time of Alexander, a record of eclipses from 2234 B.C. the age of Nimrod. It was as president of a body pursuing a grand and wholly unsuperstitious study, combined with moral, social, and political inquiries, that Daniel continued his connexion with the Magi.

<sup>3</sup> An observation of Hegel, quoted by Auberlen (p. 24).

The first question of all, as it is regarded by the critics, touches the structure and the language of the Book of Daniel. Let us dwell a little upon it. The work was written in Asia, a fact of great hermeneutical importance, which has been almost invariably disregarded by the expositors of the prophecy. There are two parts which overlap one another. In the earlier part you are carried forward as far as the reign of Cyrus; in the latter part you are carried back to the reign of Belshazzar. The anticipations at the opening of what is to come, the allusions in the close to what has been recorded, demonstrate the unity of the book. The earlier part is historical and actual—a record for the heathen world, and written in its dialect; the later part is personal and prophetic. Chap. i. to ii. 4 is written in the sacred language, and forms a kind of preface. The Syriac, or diplomatic language, commences at ii. v. 4, and is continued down to the end of the seventh chapter. The remaining five chapters are in Hebrew, as pure and more severe than that of Ezekiel. The subject matter is varied with great art—visions and judgments, and manifestations of the power of God, succeeding one another in order. The vision of the dream-image is followed by the Divine manifestation in the furnace. Nebuchadnezzar's own dream is followed by his punishment. The vision of the man's hand at the idol feast by the punishment of Belshazzar. The blasphemous assumption of Darius by the deliverance of Daniel. The seventh chapter—the first section of the prophetic part, the last of the first division—is written in Aramaic, and argues the unity of the book as well as the unity of the author, and it may be said that the theory of more than one author has been abandoned in despair. Ezra includes in the book that bears his name a state paper in Aramaic. The Aramaic of Daniel presents some Aryan terms: and it is incumbent on our modern Porphyrians to explain how a Jew living B.C. 163 could be familiar with Aryan designations for officers and offices dead and gone four hundred years. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra—the earliest document in the Scribe is six years later than the Prophet's—have only a dialectic difference, and both differ very markedly from the Aramaic of the Targums, which are of the date of the Pseudo-Daniel. The differences between Daniel and Ezra are such as preclude the idea of imitation. It is argued in 'Essays and Reviews' (p. 76) that the use of *Macedonian*<sup>1</sup> words, such as *symphonia*

<sup>1</sup> In his anxiety to disprove the authenticity and inspiration of the Book of Daniel, Dr. Rowland Williams terms *symphonia* and *psanterion* (!) not Greek but *Macedonian* words. He intimates that there are several such words, since he gives these two by way of example only. His language is, 'not only Macedonian words, such as *symphonia* and *psanterion* (!), but the texture of the Chaldee, with such

and *pesanterion* (Dr. Rowland Williams alone has the credit of this astonishing discovery) argues the lateness of the writing of the book. When it is remembered that Babylon, the metropolis of the world, must, as such, have received into herself the products and usages of all nations; that the Orontes did not yet flow into the Tiber, but that all currents from the east and west flowed into the Euphrates, it cannot but seem a very Quixotic piece of literary chivalry to conclude a forgery from the appearance in a work professing to be written at and in the language of Babylon, some few foreign words. Indian names were current in Jerusalem under Solomon. Commerce with Phœnicia, or the conflicts of Sennacherib with the Greeks, beside many other means, might have introduced foreign musical instruments into Babylon before the days of Nebuchadnezzar. Dr. Williams says that *pesanterion* is a version of *ψαλτήριον*, a Macedonian instrument, which the Macedonians, interchanging λ and ν, pronounced *ψαντήριον*. But *ψαλτήριον* occurs in the LXX. and other Greek versions of the Scriptures, and in classic authors, while *ψαντήριον* is never met. Of Macedonian instruments and music we know exactly nothing; they were never heard of till the creative fancy of Dr. Williams added one more to the five recognised Grecian moods; and as we have no proof whatever that the Macedonians did interchange λ and ν, the result is that we have, as it is well stated, 'an imaginary dialectic variation to account for an imaginary Greek word.'

Grecisms in Daniel have been created by the critics, and abandoned by all but that forlorn hope of his school, Dr. Williams. Rabbinisms were also invented by Bertholdt, and silently put aside. They were in the end as quietly dropped, as in the outset they were audaciously put forth. Bertholdt then

'Appealed to his own critical tact that the Hebrew of Daniel must be two centuries later than Ezekiel, Jeremiah, or such Psalms as were written during or soon after the Captivity. He himself, he says, "could not support this by proof in that place without taking up the room required for other more necessary investigation."

'late forms, &c. remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book.' Essays and Reviews, p. 76. Yet this hardy assertion proceeds from the same pen which had just before written, 'How unlike is English to Welsh and Greek to Sanscrit, yet all indubitably of one family of languages! What years were required to create the existing divergence of members of this family?' Dr. Rowland Williams thus clearly evinces his knowledge of the affinities between the Greek and Eastern languages. When, therefore, he affirmed the existence of Macedonian words in the Book of Daniel, as if this were an established fact, he must have known that he had no authority for the allegation, except, in the case of one of these words, an innuendo of Gesenius, which, in another part of the same work, is contradicted by Gesenius himself. As regards the other, no Hebrew scholar ever dreamt of asserting a Macedonian origin; and Meier, one of the best of his own school, declares that it is unquestionably Shemitic. Boyle, 55 n.



'It were an easy but unsatisfactory way, simply to show that the words alleged by Von Lengerke [as proving the Hebrew of Daniel to be of a later date] as far as they prove anything, coincide with the age and circumstances of Daniel. This, however, would only have been an answer to the individual. I have, therefore, expressly examined with this object, every notable word and idiom used in the Hebrew of Daniel, and have set down under four heads—1. What is peculiar to Daniel; 2. What he has in common with the middle period of language (*i.e.* words or idioms not occurring in the Pentateuch, but received in books free from the influence of Aramaic;); 3. What Daniel has in common with the later writers (*i.e.* words or idioms which, in our remaining Hebrew, do not occur before the time bordering on the Captivity, or Jeremiah); 4. What, like other of the sacred writers of the same date, he has revived out of the Hebrew of the Pentateuch. The inquiry was simply historical, *where* any words or idioms employed by Daniel occurred in previous or contemporary Hebrew. There is, for the most part, little characteristic in any of this language. In very many words or idioms which do not occur at any earlier date, there is no reason from the nature of the language why they should not. The unchanging East has not our variation of language. The inhabitants of Mecca still speak, in its purity, that same Arabic in which the Koran was written twelve centuries ago. What is characteristic, however, falls in with the time of Daniel.'—Pp. 25, 36.

Daniel freely moulds his language for himself, like all Scripture writers, availing himself of the writings of his predecessors. His style varies as he employs the simple narrative, or soars in prayer and thanksgiving, or transcribes the vision, or sets down a 'condensed descriptive prophecy,' like chap. xi. With the exception of the one naturalized word, *pathbag* (or 'royal meats'), the Aryan words are confined to his *narrative*. The statement of De Wette, accepted too readily by Mr. Boyle (28), that Aramaic is a *patois*, is a mere assertion. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is the Aramaic of Babylonia; that of Jonathan and Onkelos is the Aramaic of Palestine. The Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is virtually identical. The question is whether these writers are to be regarded as contemporaries, or as separated by a gap of 370 years. We have said that the Aramaic of these two writers is virtually identical. The variations are such as preclude the idea of imitation. A false Daniel would never have been content to half-copy the idiom of a writer whom it was his interest to counterfeit wholly. It has been demonstrated<sup>1</sup> that all the differences between the scriptural Aramaic and that of the Targum are traceable to the Aramaic of the period. That the book is written in both languages suits the times and position of Daniel, and cannot be explained by those who refer it to the age of the Maccabees.

<sup>1</sup> 'It has been alleged by the Essayist that in the Aramaic of Daniel the "h" had passed into the "n" in both "*den*" *this* and "*illen*" *these*, and that this "change is an evidence of later language." The major premiss must be that "it is known that in Daniel's time they had not so passed." The *h* does not pass into the *n* at all; *n* is not one of those letters into which *h* ever passes' (p. 53).



'No other book, or portion of a book, of the canon approximate to that date. The last book, Nehemiah, was finished two and a half centuries before, viz. about B.C. 410.'

Not the least important part of Dr. Pusey's book are the appendixes. The first is a note from Professor Max Müller, on the Aryanisms of Daniel. The last is on a very different subject, the 'secular predictions which Dr. Stanley parallels, 'in regard to exactness of fulfilment, with those of the Old Testament;' and in this note, which is very well worth reading, Dr. Stanley sustains that exposure which every one deserves who mixes up his prose with poetry, and draws upon his fancy both for his faith and for his facts. The fifth note is on the wilful variations of the LXX.; the second, third, and fourth are on the language of the Book of Daniel—its Hebrew, Aryan, and Chaldee characteristics. They are all exhaustive. At the commencement of the first of these, B, the writer points out *what the argument of the critics required, and what they have offered.* Their argument required them to prove, for the demonstration of the later date, that the *style of the book was different in character from those written soon after the Captivity;* while the evidence chiefly brought forward is that *it has certain words in common with them!* Daniel revives idioms out of the Pentateuch, as does Ezekiel; and in many other respects he agrees with Ezekiel. Therefore—oh highest triumph and most saving fact of our recent criticism—Daniel is 400 years later than Ezekiel!

Let us proceed to consider the historical contents of the book:—

The royal boy-exile Daniel was received into the university<sup>2</sup> of the Chaldees when fourteen years of age. During those years he declined feasting on the idol-meats of the palace; and his three years' training completed, he entered on that career of public life which we can trace down to the third year of Cyrus (B.C. 534). How long he survived that date we know not. As Achilles opens and Alexander closes<sup>3</sup> the history of Grecian chivalry, so Joseph opens and Daniel closes the history of God's revelations to heathendom. The rabbinical tradition that he

<sup>1</sup> Mr. McGill's Essay, 'The Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra,' *Journal of Sacred Literature*, January, 1861.

<sup>2</sup> At Warka and Borsippus the Chaldeans had schools for the study of astronomy, a knowledge of which science they would seem to have brought from Egypt, to which country it was most probably communicated by Abraham at the time of his visit there. Genesis xii. According to Berosus, there existed at Babylon, in the time of Alexander, a record of eclipses from 2234 B.C. the age of Nimrod. It was as president of a body pursuing a grand and wholly unsuperstitious study, combined with moral, social, and political inquiries, that Daniel continued his connexion with the Magi.

<sup>3</sup> An observation of Hegel, quoted by Auberlen (p. 24).

returned and ruled in Judea does violence to all the probabilities. Nebuchadnezzar made him ruler of Babylon and chief of the Magi, and one of the privy counsellors of the king; a class not summoned to take any part in the ceremonies at the inauguration of the golden image.<sup>1</sup> His position as chief of the Magi he continued to hold, although he did not appear at the summons of Belshazzar, when called to be present at an idol banquet, with 'the astrologers' of the city. In acknowledgment of the service done in reading the writing on the wall,<sup>2</sup> he was restored to his political dignities, and made next to Nabonedus, and Belshazzar. He was made 'third in the kingdom.' If Darius the Mede be regarded as the delegated king or viceroy of Babylon under Cyrus, the position which Daniel held under him was still virtually 'third;' for he was first of the presidents who were set over the satraps or lieutenants of the whole kingdom. He tells us himself that he continued to prosper in the reign of Cyrus the Persian (vi. 28). Ezekiel selected him, as a contrast for wisdom, to the Prince of Tyre, eighteen years after Daniel had interpreted the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. Later on Ezekiel reckons him with Noah and Job; naming him between them. The first had sought the redemption of mankind; the second had sought the preservation of his own people; the third had prayed for the welfare of his own family. 'Though these three men were there'—(xiv. 14—20)—in the land, 'they shall deliver neither son nor daughter, they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness.' The founder, the teacher, the prophet of the human race, they each, with decreasing success, interceded with God for what they loved. Thus Ezekiel proves the historical personality of Daniel of Babylon. All attempts to prove the texts of Ezekiel interpolations have at last been abandoned. 'Ewald is right,' says Bunsen, in declaring that 'Daniel had been carried captive by Pul to Nineveh.' Two centuries afterwards this Daniel appears rehabilitated in the Daniel of Babylon. For he prophesied by the Tigris—forty miles from the Euphrates! and the winged lion was a symbol of the Assyrian *not* of the Babylonian empire. But the over-learned Bunsen, in his much dreaming—with that facility of speculation which one may admire in a Polonius—erred in likening the sublime calm benign cherubic symbols of Assyria

<sup>1</sup> Corn. a Lap. and Mald. suppose it to have been an image of Nebuchadnezzar himself, and devised to ensnare the Jews.

<sup>2</sup> Probably old Hebrew characters, which, in the absence of vowel helps, would seem to those untrained in the language capable of many and contradictory renderings. As it is, the words have a *twofold* meaning—'Numbered' and 'ended,' 'weighed' and 'light,' 'divided' and 'Persian.' Daniel read the writing thirty-four years after he had expounded Nebuchadnezzar's dream.

to the forms which Daniel might have seen in the temples of Nimrud; lions portrayed as the prophet portrays them, full of devouring fierceness and rage. The hypothesis of an earlier Daniel needs 'a securer historical basis.' Nebuchadnezzar was probably the grandest monarch that ever held sway on earth. Nothing can be more touching or more reverential than the demeanour of Daniel towards the king, as indeed also towards the pusillanimous Darius. Had Daniel been influenced by a parænetic purpose, had he been engaged in moulding possible facts to serve the uses of the hour, he would have given a very different colouring to the history of Nebuchadnezzar; the king's acknowledgment of the Most High would have been more sincere, and his repentance more complete. So in fact it has been represented by one who may have had some such parænetic purpose in view—we mean the LXX. translator. It would be vain to attempt to depict the sublimity and pathos which breathes around the historical scenes of Daniel. In an uninspired writer, such a sketch as that of Belshazzar's feast, embodying every conception that is endeared to high art, where the magnificence, the light, the revelry, the 'abandon' of imperial pomp fade away before the finger of a man's hand, before the prophet from his cell, into gloom, horror, and despair, would be pronounced unapproachable and immortal for its fidelity, at once tender and severe fidelity to nature. It is true that 'we murder to dissect;' it is the pursuit of truth, and that alone which can justify the violence. The coarse and vulgar industry that hacks and mangles, and so dissects in order to murder, is insensible and dead alike to beauty and to truth. Daniel is a Pharisee because he fasts; and he is a fanatic because he perseveres in and watches unto prayer.<sup>1</sup> The perverse industry of the neologist school has devised several historical inaccuracies in the Book of Daniel. He speaks of Darius the Mede. By whatever name this prince may have been known in profane history, a failure in identifying him cannot really affect the statement of the prophet. It is objected that the Median supremacy did not last till the taking of Babylon, and Daniel expressly states that Darius as a viceroy received the charge of Babylon. Thus the prophet fares worse now than of old in the lions' den. Now it is Scylla or Charybdis. If he is too accurate, he must not be, if he is the least inaccurate he cannot be, a prophet. In the very first verse of the Book Daniel is inaccurate—so much the worse for the Pseudo-Daniel. Yet he only says that Nebuchadnezzar *besieged*, not that he took Jerusalem. This expedition, implied by Berosus,

<sup>1</sup> He retired to his chamber to pray, where his accusers 'pressed tumultuously' in upon him and found him (p. 446).

was in the year before Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne; where he filled the same position as regards his father that we find Darius subsequently filling as regards Cyrus. Those recently discovered Babylonian cylinders have not done much to back up the cause of the neologians, whose retractions have been as disastrous as a retreat from Moscow. Belshazzar's name—deciphered at the same time in England and Chaldæa—is no longer a 'false name.' But which, it is well said, was the more likely to have known a name unknown to Babylonian, Persian, and Greek historians,—the contemporary prophet in Babylon, or the Jew living four centuries later in Palestine? How Belshazzar came to be related to Nebuchadnezzar, whether his father was adopted into the family of Nebuchadnezzar, or Nabonedus sought to strengthen his position on an uninherited throne by marriage with one of the old dynasty—as Herod did when he married Marianne—concerns us very little. This link, like many others, may in time be recovered. But when the critics of our day know a little more Chaldee, and are a little better acquainted with Scripture, they will understand why the prophet did not put in the queen-mother's lips the term 'grand-father'—Chaldee knows no such word; they will understand how unnecessary, according to the usage of Scripture, would such precision be.<sup>1</sup> But why was not the Pseudo-Daniel more accurate? In the Assyrian inscriptions, Sargon, though only connected perhaps by marriage with his predecessors, speaks of the 'kings, my fathers.' It was easy for these critics to mis-translate Daniel, and make him say what he does *not* say—that he was in Susa—to show that Susa was not then built, nor Elam conquered by Nebuchadnezzar. The 'dura ilia' of these literary reapers were and are equal to all this: but every one of these assumptions is false, while at the same time they display an ignorance that is portentous. Witness the testimony of Xenophon, Herodotus, and Strabo. But the satraps were not Babylonian officers; and how could there have been so many under Darius the Mede? The Sanscrit term Satrap signifies a vice-king, such as Berosus expressly declares existed under Nabopolossar. The testimony of Xenophon only goes so far as to say that Cyrus did not send *Persian* satraps to the conquered nations. And the Book of Esther implies that there were 127 satrapies. Then supposing all this explained, our critics observe, How could the lions have lived in a *cistern-like hole, void of air*? This is Dr. Davidson's dissenting way of putting it. The Jews

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pusey quotes, on the point, Gen. xxxi. 42, Num. xviii. 2, Deut. xxvi. 5, Exod. xviii. 4, 2 Sam. ix. 7, 1 Kings xv. 13, *ib.* 9, 2 Sam. xiv. 27, 2 Chron. iii. 2, 1 Kings xv. 11, 2 Kings xviii. 3, 2 Chron. xxix. 2, 2 Kings xvi. 2, 2 Chron. xxviii. 1, 2 Kings xiv. 3, &c.

who kept the Emperor's lions at Fez (p. 416) were more happy than Dr. Davidson. 'But to invent absurdities betrays the *'malus animus* of the critic; the prophet remains unharmed as 'he was in the lion's den.' We may dismiss the charge of ignorance as regards the Magi, whom the Pseudo-Daniel must have had opportunities of being accurate about. Daniel mentions five different *classes* or *kinds* of illuminati. Porphyry mentions the three *degrees* in the highest, that is, the priestly order of the Magi. There is no other way of explaining according to facts what he states, unless it can be shown that the Magi were all priests. The *Chaldeans* were known as the *priests*. Strabo expressly tells us that there were *many kinds* of astronomical Chaldeans. The generic name which Daniel employs is 'all the wise men of Babylon.' The endeavour to prove a threefold division of the ancient Egyptian and Parsee priesthood, like all the efforts of the neologians to be learned, or to seem so, proves an utter failure. Of the Egyptian priesthood all we know is from Christian times, and the division was not into *three* but five. Of the three degrees of the Parsee priesthood we know that the names are modern, and that they are unknown to the Zendavesta.

Inaccuracies are followed by improbabilities. Physiology confirms every feature of the insanity of Nebuchadnezzar. Dr. Pusey quotes, amid other remarkable instances, that of the Père Surin (p. 430) who never lost in his afflicting malady the consciousness of his own personal identity; 'the description of himself is a 'most wonderful specimen of acute mental analysis while 'outwardly he was a maniac.' The improbability urged against his prayer before his restoration to reason implies the greatest want of reason and observation in those who object to it. The very fetters of brass and iron, and the homeless lodging (so in keeping with S. Mark v. 3, 4), mark that unskilful management of the insane only of late years abandoned among ourselves. 'But profane history says nothing of this illness of Nebuchadnezzar.' Yet Abydenus mentions a supernatural state which befell Nebuchadnezzar; and Berosus mentions a sickness of Nebuchadnezzar during which all his mighty works were suspended. Eusebius regarded the passage of Abydenus as referring to the narrative of Daniel. Berosus observes incidentally, that one chief Magus kept the government for Nebuchadnezzar on his father's death until he returned from his Egyptian campaign. And it is not unreasonable to suppose that a like regency undertook a like task until the mental recovery of the great king. Any one familiar with the real history of Constantine will find no difficulty in understanding how, under less convictions, Nebuchadnezzar should, however awed

and solemnized, have remained unconverted. But he felt, and the conviction was a glorious and a blessed one, that he was the object of God's care; and this conviction is expressed in his proclamation. The whole account is so truthlike, that it argues the authenticity and genuineness of the Prophet.

Human nature is the same. Caligula, six centuries later, would be worshipped as Nebuchadnezzar; for Nebuchadnezzar probably learned during his conquests how Egypt and Persia adored their kings. The Persians, borrowing from the Medes, worshipped their kings as the presence of Ormuzd, and so Darius enacts the God. That the statue should want proportion is in accordance with the ideal effect aimed at, and the usage of antiquity, which maintained no human proportion in the images of the sun gods—the Colossus of Rhodes was ten ells higher than the statue of Nebuchadnezzar. It is urged, indeed, that intolerance was unknown to Babylonians and Persians. But as Babylon had robbed Assyria of her gods, and Cambyes had plundered Egypt of some of her gods; as the Zoroastrian system took its rise in intense hatred of the Vedic worshippers, and was propagated as eagerly by the sword as Mahomedanism itself; we can hardly say that Babylonians and Persians were tolerant. The edict of Darius—commanding men not to attempt anything against the God of Daniel—was very probably, was most naturally, written by Daniel. The objection that it was written by a Jew concedes the fact of the decree itself. In the space of seventy years occurred three miracles. And this is called ‘an *objectless lavishing of miracles*’—‘a prodigal expenditure unworthy of the Deity!’ What miracle in Dr. Davidson’s judgment would not be ‘objectless?’ What number would not be too many? Two edicts were issued by the supreme world-power, designed to extinguish the true faith on the earth; and once an unprecedented profanity and insult was offered to the Most High God. In each case a miracle succeeded: each case was a fitting crisis, a ‘*dignus vindice nodus*.’ Each miracle resulted in a decree in favour of the Jews. Each miracle was calculated to console them in their expatriation. Each miracle must have taught the nations for the time, though it might have only ‘overcome them as a summer cloud’ in the final issue. But if for the time fraught with ‘special wonder,’ these portents, by thus awing the heathen, attained a great object.

‘Daniel wrote of certain events which he was inspired to record in detail. He relates them (which is a stamp of truth) without any explanation, in all simplicity. He alludes in his narrative to kings unknown to Grecian historians, and to the relations of empires; he mentions whole classes of officers, and the names of their offices, partly Semitic, partly of Aryan origin, and gradations of their ranks; wise men in their classes; even musical instruments



of different nations, and names of articles of dress which Hebrews do not use; he assigns dates freely; he describes what was probably a marvellous and very rare disease of the great monarch, and the fact of his praying amid extreme mental alienation, a fact which seems in the highest degree improbable, but is accordant with known facts; he alludes to customs, personages: he gives a scene from the interior of Babylon on the night of its capture, when, contrary to ordinary eastern custom, he mentions the presence of the ladies of the harem, and distinct from these, and not present at the feast, the queen-mother speaking in a tone of authority; he tells even of the plain stucco on the walls of the banquet-room, such as, notwithstanding the prevailing taste for ornament, is still found in the corresponding palaces of Nineveh; he alludes, in one word, even to the custom of eastern kings (such as we find it among Persians and Parthians), to lie at table by themselves, *over against* their guests, probably for safety sake; he gives events of that night which fill it up, adversaries have said, even to overflowing, but for which time is left, since the fact is supplied, that the capture was not until morning; he describes capital punishments under the Babylonian and Persian kings, varying, in one respect, in conformity with their religion; the furnace he describes as one only could have described it who had seen such. In his natural, truthful, and so fearless description, he again and again tells us what for us, who have only an antiquarian knowledge of these things, it requires thought to harmonise; he explains nothing, as writers do at a period somewhat later than the events which they describe, or when they write for a wider or different circle. The accounts are minute, graphic; he accumulates the names of the classes which he mentions, whether of officers, wise men, or musical instruments. Those who have been on watch for his halting, have thought again and again that they have found some flaw which should loosen the whole fabric. Look closer, and you see that the parts fit closely together; that the more closely you press the expressions, the more exactly they correspond.'—Pp. 458—460.<sup>1</sup>

The profane Jew who ventured to invent Divine Revelations, who was not stoned by his co-religionists and fellow-countrymen, but accepted as the Paraclete of his age, is to be regarded as having, for the most part, shrunk from any attempt to meddle with prophecy, the 'non imitabile fulmen' of the Most High. The prophecy of the four kingdoms and of the seventy weeks must come to a close in the age of Antiochus Epiphanes. We shall proceed to examine the question of Daniel's inspiration in the first place as regards these two passages; and in the second place we shall pass in review those points of doctrine and practice which are held to indicate a later date in this Book of Scripture than that assigned by the testimony of the Church.

I. (a) To state the question accurately as regards the four kingdoms of the dream-image, and the beasts, we must bear in mind that the argument is connected with a popular tradition, not with a divine solution. The fifth kingdom is Christ's; is universally allowed to be so: and this upon the warrant of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pusey acknowledges how much he is indebted in this passage to Hengstenberg, whom elsewhere he always quotes with respect. Messrs. Clark would do well to reissue the very valuable work with such additional annotations as will adapt it to the changed state of the controversy, and the advance of antiquarian discovery. They have done a great service in their reprint of the valuable work by Auberlen.



Christ himself, who taking up the prophetic *Key-word*, declares Himself again and again to be *The Stone*. The time of the kingdom of the Stone is *outside*, so to speak, the time of the other kingdoms. It may be at once fitter and truer to say that the Stone was cut out of the mountain in the days of that empire which is commonly regarded as answering in a great measure the description of the fourth kingdom. But the excision of the Stone, and the establishment of its earth-filling dominion, are two things quite distinct, both in symbol and in fact. The kingdom which we yet pray for has not yet come. So far we have a divine exposition, which we cannot put aside. Christendom professes to be waiting for the consummation of the prophecy. Dr. Pusey seems to be much indebted, in tracing out the traditional rendering of the symbols, to the suggestive and minute criticism of Hofmann; and he is in favour of regarding the four empires as the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman. 'Even an opponent has said, "it is in favour of 'this interpretation that the two feet of iron can be referred to 'the Eastern and Western empire:"' but it is obvious to remark that, with this arrangement, we have both feet ruling in Europe. The symbols suit the four empires as closely as the words of the Lord's last discourse suit the destruction of Jerusalem. So venerable a tradition, *embodying a legitimate application* of the symbols, and promoting for the time all the purposes of the revelation, can compete without fear of confusion with the fancies of the school of Porphyry.

'Of the last empire, like the first, Daniel sees not only certain characteristics but a history. Intervals of its history are marked. It embraces a long period. The beast appears at first with the ten horns at once, as the third with its four heads. Its characteristic is stupendous strength, as that of the third is manifold intelligence. But although in order to manifest its unity it appears as one whole, the explanation shows that the ten horns belong to a subsequent stage of its existence. These ten horns, or kingdoms, are also to be contemporaneous. They are all prior in time to the little horn which is to arise out of them. *Another*, he says, *shall arise after them, and diverse from the rest*; as the whole kingdom shall be diverse from those kingdoms which were before it. Yet the ten horns or kingdoms are to continue on together, until after the eleventh shall have risen up; for it is to rise up among them, and to destroy three of them. The description in itself implies that the ten horns symbolize ten kingdoms, not ten kings only. For in this way only could the two traits be compatible, that the eleventh was to *come up among them*, and yet *after them*.

'So then within the period of the fourth empire, there are these distinct periods. 1. The time until it is divided into the ten portions symbolized by the ten horns, as, before, it was represented as ending in *the ten toes*; 2. The period of those ten horns; 3. That in which the eleventh, diverse from the rest, held its sway; 4. The period after the destruction of that power and of the whole four kingdoms, which is to perish with him.

'The latter part of this, being still future, we cannot explain certainly. Prophecy is not given to enable us to prophesy, but as a witness to God when

the time comes. This prophecy reaches on to the end of time; much of it is confessedly expanded in the Revelation as still to come. It would then be as inconsistent in us to attempt to explain it, as it would in the school of Porphyry not to explain it. For according to them it refers to past facts. They assume the book to have been written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, to relate to his times, and to be intended to influence his times. Thus they are bound by their own hypothesis to expound it, if they can, of those times. For according to them it represents past facts. The impossibility of pointing out these has since Porphyry's time been one chief rock on which those theories have been wrecked.—Pp. 76—79.<sup>1</sup>

In the symbol of the Greek empire (chap. viii.) the fourth horn issued in the little horn. The divine solution of a part of this symbol leaves little doubt that Antiochus Epiphanes is represented here. But the little horn of the fourth beast-kingdom comes not out of any horn, but out of the body of the Empire, and is held to be a mystic symbol of the Antichrist, of whom Antiochus Epiphanes himself was a type. The Porphyrians are wholly unable to fit this symbol to the time of Antiochus. What is said of Antiochus Epiphanes exactly applies to him. What is said of Antichrist does not. In chapter xi. Antiochus is again introduced; and then the Resurrection, with that fore-shortening which is a feature of divine prophecy, is described as immediately ensuing. But here the individual appears as a type, and melts at once into his antitype. Between the two there is but one feature in common mentioned, and that one common to all the profane, 'speaking against God.' Antichrist is to perish in the Holy Land; Antiochus died miserably at Tabes, in Persia.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, the endeavour to contract the vision to the horizon of B.C. 170, has proved a very disastrous failure. To make two kingdoms out of the Medes and Persians, contradicts profane history and Daniel, or Pseudo-Daniel. By making the third kingdom Alexander's, and the fourth that of his successors, our critics make the latter more powerful than their founder.

<sup>1</sup> We respectfully demur to the idea, for which we can find no room in the text, that the toes and horns are not congenial with the legs and the body. The little horn is the only after-birth of the symbol. The minuteness with which Hofman investigates the symbols will, to say the least, justify this objection being expressed. 'The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom,' and the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise when the kingdom rises.

<sup>2</sup> As in the New Testament we have three designations of the enemy of Jesus—*The Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, and Antichrist*; so in the Old Testament, in Daniel, we have a similar threefold designation. The little horn of chap. vii. and the little horn of chap. viii. exhibit, the former the *spiritual*, the latter the *political*, while the king of fierce countenance of chap. ix. portrays the *personal*, character of the Antichrist. Dr. Pusey holds that the little horns are not identical, and that the passage of the fierce king embraces type and antitype. The second, by fixing attention on Antiochus Epiphanes, the third, by depicting the character of the great reprobate, help to the right understanding of the first.

'There is no tenable way, then, in which the empires of Alexander and his successors, either together or apart, can be made into the fourth empire. Not together; for counted together, they make the third, not the fourth, empire; not Alexander's successors alone, both because they are, in no sense, by themselves an empire, and the theory patently contradicts the symbol in both visions, which it ought to explain. There is no possible explanation moreover, either way, of the tenfold division of the fourth empire, expressed alike in the toes of the image and the horns of the fourth beast, nor any solution, how, if the little horn (the eleventh) were Antiochus Epiphanes, he overthrew three of these ten. But granted to these interpreters, for the time, all which they ask; that the ten horns are individual kings, not kingdoms; supposing too, for the time (what contradicts the text), that seven out of the ten kings need not be contemporaneous with the eleventh, who is to overthrow three of them; still the interpreters cannot make out either the ten kings or the three specified in the vision.—Pp. 147, 148.

All efforts to meet these points have proved wretched and discreditable failures. With the latest of these pseudo-critics, to take ten for 'a round number,' as Herzfeld does, may be very specious; only where are the *Kingdoms* to which the ten applies? There are none such, if we do not accept in lieu of them the twenty-eight *Satrapies*! There is no attempt to meet the testimony of Josephus, who without doubt regarded the fourth Empire as the Roman; nor do the impugnors of the canonical authority of Daniel seem acquainted with, or if acquainted with, they modestly decline every attempt to account for, that Eastern tradition which symbolizes the four empires under the tree of such marvellous root that from it grew the four stems—one of gold, one of silver, one of steel, and one of iron. 'After this kingdom comes, according to the Persian doctrine, Sosiosh, the Saviour' (p. 97). A tradition among the Jews regarded the four empires much as they are counted in the popular tradition of Christendom; and certainly as overstepping the time of Antiochus. A heathen tradition, agreeing with the Christian and Jewish traditions in the conclusions which are admitted by all believers in Revelation, affirms that there are four empires, the last merging into that of the Saviour, marking an epoch that lies beyond the date of 170 B. C. This is the testimony that our Græcomaniacs have yet to encounter and overthrow; the 'non exsuperabile saxum.'

(b) We pass to the other prophecy of Daniel, which resembles that of chap. viii. inasmuch as it is furnished with a Divine solution.

The endeavour to explain the prophecy of the seventy weeks, so that it should end in Antiochus Epiphanes, is a splendid failure. The table which we have already placed before our readers shows how little unanimity there is among these new lights. This is the one prophecy of Daniel to which subsequent Scripture furnishes the solution. Four edicts were issued within

a space of ninety years; in the first year of Cyrus, in the third of Darius, in the seventh and twentieth of Artaxerxes. Of these edicts, the second and fourth only enlarged and confirmed what was already granted by the first and third. But the first and second relate only to the rebuilding of the temple, while the third expressly authorizes Ezra to restore and build Jerusalem. Ezra's mission began Nisan, 458 B.C., and the date, 483 years, determines Nisan, A.D. 26, and also coincides with the beginning of the mission of the Baptist and the anointing of the Holy One, promised by Gabriel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, when the Prince became Messiah. The seventy weeks are divided into four parts: 49 years + 434 years (= 7 weeks + 62 weeks = 69 weeks) +  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years +  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years = 1 week. At the close of the former term of three and a half years, or 'in the midst of the week,' He shall cause 'sacrifice and the oblation to cease.' The last term of three and a half years does not appear again in Scripture till reproduced by S. John as the measure of the days of Antichrist. The whole term of 490 years is broken by the subtraction of a term—the square of seven—at its beginning, and seven at its close; and these two terms, according to the well-known import of the number, imply two periods of revelation. The time of restoration exhausted the forty-nine years, under Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi; the last seven years, including the final ἀποκατάστασις, mark the whole revelation of the Incarnate God. Between these, the sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, are interposed—'a number altogether without relation to the significant fundamental numbers.'<sup>1</sup> A period, therefore, is implied, insignificant and troublous, as devoid of divine revelation, but closing in *Messiah the Prince*,<sup>2</sup> who as Prince rejected, and as Messiah cut off, was then to cast off His people; while another prince was to come, whose people, against his wish, would destroy and bring to an end and scatter that untoward generation. Thus the sacrifice was done away, the everlasting righteousness was inherited by a remnant, and the covenant of life was confirmed with many.

Our critics, judicially blinded, assume that Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years' captivity was not fulfilled in Cyrus's decree, forgetting that with the contemporaries of their Pseudo-Daniel it was '*de fide*' to believe that it had then attained its fulfilment. To convert this definite prophecy into a period of 490 years; to represent the decree to build and restore Jeru-

<sup>1</sup> Auberlen.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Auberlen on the change in the use of these titles, Dan. ix. 25, 26. S. John (Rev. i. 5) in a remarkable way reproduces the designation of prince in reference to this text.

salem as requiring 434 years for its fulfilment; to transfer the numbers, and arrange the 49, 434, 7 in the novel order 434, 7, 49; to halve the whole 490, are the efforts of a dishonest and desperate criticism. Eichhorn tried to make the theory go on all fours his own way: six years might do for seven; three years for three and a half; sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, *would go back* from the beginning of the reign of Epiphanes, when Onias was deposed, B.C. 175, to B.C. 609, three years before Jeremiah prophesied. But 'two years cannot be reckoned in septennia;' hence, as he said, 'a round reckoning never troubles itself about a trifle.' *Counting forward* from B.C. 536 we arrive at no marked year. Messiah the Prince must be a persecutor, and Xerxes will hardly be proved so bad. *Counting backward*, we have forty-nine years, only two (really three) years short of the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Jeremiah meant 490 years. It was only forty-nine years to the end of the Captivity. Count, therefore, 490 years, and deduct from them forty-nine years. Then he will have it thus: from Cyrus's command to build Jerusalem, to Nebuchadnezzar the prince, are seven weeks; and during sixty-two weeks, *from the same prophecy of Jeremiah*, street and wall shall be builded. Would such delirious fancies be tolerated for a moment in the criticism of any other ancient book than the Scriptures? But as bad is yet to come. Bertholdt, who is extolled by a writer in Smith's 'Dictionary,' decides that the seventy weeks of years are a round number, not meant to be counted—a mere 'parody on the seventy weeks of Jeremiah.' This saving criticism is, as South would say, a means of saving a deal of trouble, if nothing else. This is scientific theology, and these *agroti veteris somnia* are its happiest achievements. Wieseler held that the seventy weeks when first named by Daniel are weeks of days; when last named, are weeks of years. Lengerke supposes Daniel to have divided the seventy weeks mentally into sixty-two and eight, although neither the sixty-two weeks which are named, nor the eight which are not named, can be made to coincide with an unnamed event. To accomplish this mystical computation, the writer, dividing 7, 62, 1, is to be supposed to have placed the 7 where it is not to be counted, and to have placed the 62 between it and the 1, with which it should be counted; while it is not to be counted with the 62 with which it stands connected. We are assured that this unprejudiced exposition of the sacred text is 'uncontrovertibly certain.' The lecturer sums up the argument on the whole subject thus:—

'Antimesianic interpreters place at the end of the first three and half years, and they must place in it the utter destruction of city and temple, and (as they will have it) the destruction of the destroyer.

'The prophecy says, that at the end of the three and half first years, all sacrifice was to cease; it implies it was to cease altogether; the temple where alone it could be offered, was to be utterly destroyed; no word is said as to its restoration. Antimessianic interpreters have diverted attention from the first three and half years, at the expiration of which all sacrifice was to cease, to the last three and half years, after which they supposed it to be restored. Of these there is nothing in the text; and the desecration of the temple lasted for three years precisely, not for three and half years. Again, counting back the seven years from the only date which these interpreters can make out for themselves, the death of Antiochus (if it was so) in the spring of 163 B.C. we arrive at the spring of 170 B.C. in the middle of 142 A.S. This was two years and nine months before the desecration of the temple, but it was itself absolutely no era at all. It was eight months before even that first passing storm, when Antiochus plundered the temple of Jerusalem, as he did so many besides. It was a happy, eventless year for the Jews, when they were living every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, with no signs even of that first hurricane; much less of their long desolation. Onias, too, the exiled high priest, having been deposed by Epiphanes on his accession towards the close of A.S. 137, in the middle of B.C. 175, had been murdered three years subsequently, B.C. 172; consequently, two years before this date. Lastly, the heathenising party of the Jews also applied to Antiochus at the very beginning of his reign. Even then, on the Antimessianic theory, that "The confirming of the covenant for one week," was meant of the encouragement given by Antiochus to the apostates who applied to him, this also was prior by four years to the week, or seven years, of which it was to be a characteristic. Not a fact, then, or a date coincides. Granting these interpreters all which they ask for; allowing, which is utterly unnatural, that it should be said of one and the same earthly king, that he should destroy the city and sanctuary, confirm a covenant with many for one week, and that after half of the week, he should make sacrifice and oblation to cease, and this, in the sense that he showed favour to apostates and deserters, and made war upon the city and people; even supposing all this granted, they can give no account of those very dates in which all these things are supposed to have taken place, and which are to be the key of all the rest. Antiochus did not continue any covenant for seven years, nor did he make sacrifice to cease for half of these seven years; nor was any Messiah, or any one alleged to be a Messiah, cut off during those seven years; nor was the temple destroyed; nor were there any seven years in the period selected of one uniform marked character. Rather the seven years selected were of a most chequered character; first, nearly a year of entire peace; then horrible and cruel treachery and bloodshed; then nearly two years more of peace; then three years of intense persecution; then a respite, at least from the general of Epiphanes, for a year and five months, and victory over the petty heathen nations who assailed them. And yet the writer, living, according to these hypotheses, in Judæa, writing, as they say, to encourage their countryman, "in their great struggle against Antiochus" (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 76), could not be mistaken about what he is to have seen with his own eyes.—*Ibid.* pp. 220—222.

If there be one point clear to demonstration, it is that the Jews at the return from the Captivity had not, in the time of Epiphanes had not, before the eve of the Incarnation had not, any expectation of a Deliverer. They needed not, therefore, the writings of a Pseudo-Daniel, to console them for a disappointment which they had never experienced.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ καίρον ὥριζεν. So the phlegmatic Josephus, warm-



ing with his theme, describes the special characteristic of Daniel. It is this very definitiveness that condemns him with the critics of our age. Yet this definitiveness is not so peculiar to Daniel, as that instances of it are not to be found in other parts of Scripture. For instance, Balaam prophesies of Rome 700 years before its foundation; its maritime power, the direction, success, and final overthrow of its arms. The very office of the seer implies continual minute prediction; and Israel lived in the constant experience of the fulfilment of the blessings uttered by Jacob and Moses. Not to mention the minute predictions of other prophets; of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, of Jeremiah and Isaiah, as to the destruction of Babylon; of Jeremiah foretelling the death of the false prophet in the seventh month of the then current year; we find Isaiah foretelling the spoiling of Syria and Israel in one year; the breaking up of Ephraim in sixty-five years; the recovery of Tyre in seventy years; the overthrow of Moab in three exact years, of Ashdod in three exact years; and, again, the prolongation of Hezekiah's life for fifteen years. A vast volume of prophecy exhibits this chronological minuteness. The assailants betray their weakness by making their attack on one outwork only. The captives at Chebar, at Babylon, in Egypt had each their prophet. Of these, Daniel served as a transition-link between the Old and New Testaments. Daniel's book served the double purpose of teaching Israel fortitude under the coming troubles, and dependency on God alone for their eventual triumph. The same feature which characterises Old Testament prophecy, and Daniel particularly, 'the larger distance, and the nearer earnest,' is the most remarkable characteristic of the New Testament prediction, and demonstrates the Book of Daniel to be an integral part of the inspired word.

But what was the position of Daniel in the canon of Scripture? and when was the canon formed? The Jews of Josephus's age believed the canon to have been formed about 400 years B.C. The latest date that opponents can bring the Son of Sirach down to is B.C. 180. But this is before Antiochus, and the canon witnessed to by the Son of Sirach; and this canon contained the book of Daniel. The very existence of the Wisdom of Sirach *outside* the canon argues that the canon was closed; argues that there was no inspired authority living to include a work so framed, written in Hebrew, written in Palestine, in the canon. The tradition respecting Nehemiah, referred to in the letter at the beginning of the 2 Macc. ii. 13, how Nehemiah founded a library, bears testimony to this: that 100 years before Christ the existence of the canon was supposed. It is evident that this tradition could not have attained general acceptance in a



generation which we are to believe was itself engaged in forming the canon.

Dr. Pusey takes a rapid but instructive survey of the history of the formation of the canon, as intimated by Scripture itself. The Pentateuch, from the first, was recognised as one whole work. To this Joshua added: to this again Samuel. The Prophets, by references to the Book of the Lord, by the use they make of the writings of earlier prophets, attest the progressive formation of the canon. What historical records were required after the days of Samuel were supplied by Nathan and Gad. The contents of the Books of Kings are from the pen of Jeremiah. The Psalms were gradually formed in like manner as the first part of Scripture. And the absence of any psalm of a later imaginable date than Nehemiah, the entire absence of any Maccabean psalm, demonstrates that this part of the canon, to say the least, was closed before that age.

'The canon then was almost completed before the return from the Captivity. Of the books of the former prophets, or historical books, the Kings, at most, had yet to be formally added to it. Of the later prophets, there remained, perhaps, the formal reception of Ezekiel; the last three prophets only had not yet been sent. Of the Hagiographa, there remained the collection of some later Psalms. Some in the last book of the Psalms were not yet written; Daniel was then formally added; the historical books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. The Chronicles alone were as yet unwritten.

'In no one of these books is there anything which requires a date later than that which Josephus probably meant to fix the date of Malachi; and of the second visit of Nehemiah.'—P. 328.

We must forbear following the learned lecturer into the discussion of the internal proofs of the genuineness and authenticity of Ezra and Nehemiah, where again, in exposing the presumptions of a narrow and ignorant criticism, Dr. Pusey thrice slays the slain. The abuses which Nehemiah set himself to remedy are just the abuses and vices which Malachi denounces. The examination of the later book fully sustains the statement of Josephus. And with this agrees the tradition of the Talmud, that 'the men of the Great Synagogue wrote [*i.e.* inscribed] 'Ezekiel, the twelve [minor prophets], Daniel, and the book of 'Esther; Ezra wrote his book and the genealogies of the Chronicles down to *to*. Rab says Ezra did not go up from Babylon 'until he wrote his genealogy, and so he went up. And who 'finished it? Nehemiah.'

Daniel's *place* in the canon is just that place where we ought to have expected to find his book. He had the gift, but neither the *mission* nor the *office* of a prophet. Accordingly he ranks with David and Ezra, being, as Josephus says, 'one of the greatest prophets;' one who, according to the Talmud, 'alone outweighs all the wise of the nations.' The likeness in senti-

ment between the opening of Daniel's prayer and the two prayers in Nehemiah; the likeness in symbol to Daniel, in Zechariah's two visions, that of the *four horns*, and the four chariots followed by the prophecy of the *Man who is the Branch*; the likeness between the prayer of Daniel and the prayer of Baruch; the rendering by the LXX. of Deut xxxii. 8; the third Sybilline Book, of the date confessedly 170 B.C. which quotes the prophecy of the ten horns and the little horn, which, though the work of a fanatic, and of the age of Antiochus, omits Daniel's Messianic prophecies; the exact and simple reference of the accurate writer of 1 Macc. to the Book of Daniel: upon these points Dr. Pusey dwells successively. According to 1 Mac. the Jews 'expect a prophet hereafter.'

'The prophecies framed [by the Pseudo-Daniel], as is alleged [in order to awaken an expectation of a supernatural Deliverer], are to have been received largely and at once, and are to have been placed unhesitatingly at once among their sacred Scriptures; they are to have been referred to thenceforth as prophetic truth, and yet there is not one trace of their having the slightest influence on the minds of the people, in inspiring those hopes which they have been forged to create. The history of the Maccabees, as the authentic history of those times, contradicts the unbelieving theories as to Daniel.'—P. 375.

Other proofs that the Book of Daniel was written before the time of Antiochus may be found in the additions made to it, which supposes the book to be already known in the age of the LXX. and the course pursued by the LXX. translator. He does what the Pseudo-Daniel ought to have done. He makes Nebuchadnezzar's madness a visitation for his sacrilege against the House of God. He shows himself ignorant at every step of the history. The knowledge which Porphyry had was not—though this was his hypothesis—possessed even by the LXX. translator in the age of the Pseudo-Daniel. He does his best to fit in the seventy weeks to Antiochus. In the original numbers he substitutes twice seven, seventy, and sixty-two, and makes the number 139, and he obliterates the name and hope of Messiah. No one comments, but on an ancient work, and that a work of authority. Daniel needed to be falsified to serve the purposes for which a false Daniel was improvised. But as it is admitted that some time elapsed between the composition of the original and the translation, this compels the book to be placed before Antiochus; *where if placed, it contained prophecy of events utterly indiscernible by man.*

The last proof which Dr. Pusey discusses is that furnished by the Book of Enoch, which contains many unquestionable references to the Book of Daniel. Its date, at lowest B.C. 130—109, does not leave sufficient room after B.C. 163. This important part of his work Dr. Pusey closes in the following solemn words:—

'I cannot, as some religious and eminent defenders of the Book of Daniel have done, add to these human evidences the testimony of our Lord, or use Divine authority as a makeweight to human proof. There we are altogether on different grounds, in a different atmosphere. What I have proposed to myself in these Course of Lectures is to meet a boastful criticism upon its own grounds, and to show its failure, where it claims to be most triumphant. The authority of our Lord stands alone. It is all in all, or we should have nothing. It is the word of Him, Who being God, spake with a Divine knowledge, Perfect, Infallible. If His knowledge could have failed in any one thing, if He could (God forbid) have set His seal on one thing which is not true, Divine authority would be gone. Hesitate how men will for the while, it was truly said by one of the most powerful intellects of the day (Dr. Newman) "There is but one choice, infallibility or infidelity."—P. 393.

II. The latest and poorest argument of the Porphyrian school is that based on the assumption that Daniel exhibits a form of doctrine not met with earlier than the Sybilline Books. Messiah appears as superhuman; no traces of His divine nature are to be found in the prophets. The doctrine of the last things, and the doctrine of angels, are so largely developed as to prove the book to have been written in the latest time possible.

But is it not in the very nature of the case that a prophet, a receiver of revelation, may as the last of the line, communicate truths more, and those more fully, than his predecessors? The critics tacitly assume that there never has been a revelation, just as they assume, when they object that some miracles are objectless, that miracles are impossible. But they assume also that the belief was *not* derived in the Maccabee times from the book of Daniel.

In point of fact there are no traces of the divine nature of Messiah in the Sybilline Books; but there are such traces in the book of Enoch, in language confessedly derived from the book of Daniel. The Lord as the Interpreter of Scripture has shown the force of Ps. cx. The Holy Ghost has expounded Ps. ii. and Ps. xlv. 7. The eternal dominion of Ps. lxxii., the attribution to the promised Child (Isaiah vii.) of the title *God*, which (used 225 times absolutely in Hebrew, and always of God) in union with the attribute of *mighty* here, proves the promise to be that the Child shall be God Almighty; the prediction by Micah of the birth of Him whose outgoings have been from eternity; the prediction of Zachariah of the sorrows of Him who is *God's Fellow*; such predictions contrast strangely with the statement that 'traces of the divine nature occur nowhere besides in the Prophets,' as Dr. Davidson affirms.

The eschatological objections tell equally against Isaiah and S. Paul. In Daniel the 'last things' are foretold without any reference to time. On this point, as on so many others, the critics misrepresent him. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body, we know by the quotation of Psalm xvi. and of

Exodus iii. is taught in the Old Testament. And David and Asaph and Job knew of the beatific vision and the judgment of the Last Day. It is well known that the Zoroastrians knew nothing of the resurrection of the body until after the Christian era; and the critics have been compelled to abandon the notion that the books of the earlier Parseeism contained it. That the Zend writings speak of continued existence after death, of 'the perpetuation of life' then, is not denied; but the doctrine of the *resurrection of the body* we know was at once new and intolerable to the wisdom of heathendom.

The objections against Daniel, because of his statements respecting angels, tell alike against the New Testament and the Old. In Genesis and the Apocalypse we have the cherubim. There is that supremest of all created intelligences, the Angel of the Lord—*Angel* as to his actual nature, but representing the Divine, *the Angel-interpreter, one of a thousand, who sheweth unto man his righteousness, and is gracious unto him, and saith, Redeem him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom* (Job xxxiii. 23). Thus, in fact, the teaching of Daniel is that of all the rest of the Old Testament. Dr. Pusey examines at length the charge of Herzfeld, that the doctrine of Angels was borrowed from the Magi, and proves if there was any borrowing, the doctrine was borrowed by the Magians from the Jews. Into this discussion we cannot follow our author. He is here as exhaustive and as conclusive as elsewhere. In a religion of dualism, where the Supreme God prays to the genii, and the genii are dependent on man, one is not likely to find the source of those scriptural ideas respecting angels in which we have been educated. Indeed, the assumption is utterly futile that at any time the sacred writer borrowed ideas from heathendom. The objection raised on the ground of Daniel's teaching respecting fasting, prayer, stated times of prayer, and alms, are also examined by Dr. Pusey and refuted, and with his answer to these he regards his work as done.

In these solemn and affecting words he draws to a close:—

'Of the objections I believe, that no one would have been thought of, but for the necessity of getting rid of the miracles and prophecies of Daniel, unless people would believe them. Certainly no one objection seems to me even plausible. I have answered the objections. To convince is the office not of man but of God. Gibbon enunciated a larger truth than he was aware of, when, unable to escape from the contemporary evidence for a fact, or from its miraculousness if it were true, he said, "They all [all the witnesses of the fact] lived within the compass of a century; they all appeal to their personal knowledge or the public notoriety for the truth of a miracle which was repeated in several instances, displayed in the greatest theatre of the world, and submitted, during a series of years, to the calm examination of the senses. But the stubborn mind of an infidel is guarded by a secret incurable suspicion," incurable save by God.

'S. Paul had said the same before, "*the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*;" only it is man's own fault if, encompassed with the Gospel, he remain in, or apostatise into, a state of nature. Yet to see (as I believe) a solid answer to those objections, although it cannot give faith to one who has lost faith, may aid in beating off unbelief, or may predispose for faith. It may put a person in the position in which he will either not admit unbelief, or will seek for faith from Him who gives it to all who seek Him. It is not inquiry, but non-inquiring acquiescence in doubt which is the peril of this day. The temptation of this age is to try to find a middle path between faith and unbelief; to say "that there is much to be said on both sides;" to think that all things must be uncertain in themselves, because many of the persons around us are at sea as to all things, as if one thought all things to be in a whirl, because they seemed so to our neighbours who had dizzied themselves; to be browbeaten out of belief; to shrink from avowing a steadfast adherence to that which must be old because it is eternal, and which must be unchangeable because it is truth; to pick something out of revelation which it thinks will not be gainsayed, and to relegate all else to be matter of opinion; an indolent, conceited, soft, weak, pains-hating, trifling with the truth of God.

'It is not, for the present, a day of naked blasphemy. The age is mostly too soft for it. Voltaire's "*Ecrasez l'Infâme*" shocks it. Yet I know not whether the open blasphemy of the eighteenth century is more offensive than the cold-blooded patronizing of the nineteenth. Rebellion against God is not so degrading, nor so deceiving, as a condescending acknowledgment of His Being, while it denies His right over us. Be not, then, imposed upon by smooth words. It is an age of counterfeits. Look not only at what is said, but look for what is suppressed and tacitly left out of the Creeds. The rationalism of this day will give you good words as far as they go, but will empty them of their meaning; it will give as plausible a counterfeit as it can, but *the image and superscription* is its own. It will gild its idols for you, if you will accept them for the Living God. It will give you sentiment instead of truth, but as the price at which you are to surrender truth. It will praise Jesus as (God forgive it!) in fact an enlightened Jew—a benefactor to mankind, and it will ask you in exchange to consent not to say that He was God. It will extol His superiority to Judaism, and include under "Judaism" truths of God. It will praise His words as full of truth, and will call them, in a sense, divine truths, and will ask you in exchange, not to say that it is *the* infallible truth. It will say, in its sense, that "*the Bible contains the word of God*," and will ask of you to give up your belief that "*it is the word of God*." It will say, in *its* sense, that the prophets spake by the Holy Ghost (*i.e.* as all which is good and true is spoken by inspiration of the Spirit of God), and will ask of you, in exchange, to drop the words, or at least the meaning, of the Creed, that God the Holy Ghost "*spake by the Prophets*." It will say to you that the prophets were "*elevated by a divine impulsion*," and grant you an "*intensified presentiment*," but only in the sense common to the higher conditions of humanity, even unaided by the grace of God. It will acknowledge a fallible inspiration, fallible even as to matters of every-day morality, and will ask of you to surrender the belief in the infallible. It will descant on the love of God, if you will surrender your belief in His awful holiness and justice; it will speak with you of heaven, if you, with it, will suppress the mention of hell. It will retain the words of revelation, and substitute new meanings, if you will be content with the sound, and will part with the substance of the Word of God.

'The battle must be fought. It is half won, when any one has firmly fixed in his mind the first principles that God is All Wise and All Good, and that man's own wisdom, although from God, is no measure for the Wisdom of God, and cannot sound its depth. The criticism of rationalism is but a flimsy, trans-

parent veil, which hides from no eye except its own (if indeed it *does* hide it altogether from its own), the real ground of its rebellion, its repugnance to receive a revelation to which it must submit, in order that it may see.'—Pp. 560—563.

We have reserved for the close of this paper some few remarks on the (1) prophetical and (2) ethical uses of the book of Daniel in this our own day. If under the former head anything shall seem to be advanced savouring of modernness, the responsibility will attach to the present writer alone. Our sole object is to serve the cause of sacred truth. We do not aim at disparaging the traditional interpretations which we have inherited, but we must with all solemnity protest against their being accepted as exhaustive.

1. The elder Apocalypse differs considerably from the later in this respect, that around the former there is gathered a venerable body of recognised exposition, while as regards the book of S. John, albeit saints have written fully on it—as, for instance, Irenæus and Hippolytus,—none of the expositions in whole or part have passed into and been united with the 'consciousness' of Christendom, if we except the one point that Babylon is an apocalyptic designation of Rome. Each Apocalypse consists of two parts—an historical and prophetical. The foreground in Daniel is laid in pagan times and climes; the foreground of S. John in an age that witnessed the trials of the Church. By parity of reasoning we might conclude that we can know no more with certainty of the earlier than of the later prophet. Time and sorrow in the case of the prophetical parts of both books will unfold to the Church the secret of the mystery—the number of the years, and the travail they will bring. The very fact that S. John has woven into his own book the substance of Daniel's visions, should warn us against concluding that there has been any large or final accomplishments of those predictions. The long chapter describing the dealings with one another of the northern and southern kings: shall we regard this as finally and exhaustively fulfilled? We mean so much of it as had an early realization in the history of the Seleucidæ and Lagidæ. To us it seems to be 'in contempt of question' that of even this prophetic passage the *ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν* will not be recorded till it is verified by the Eastern Antichrist, of whom Antiochus Epiphanes was only the feeble and far-off shadow. If we turn to the much more serious question of the visions and revelations touching the four empires—'the kingdoms that were to come,' as Origen expresses it, 'from the time of Daniel down to the destruction of the world'—it must on reflection appear to every thoughtful reader passing strange, that the Church should have allowed



the old tradition to become almost *de fide*, which sees in the four kingdoms the four old world-monarchies, every one of which has come to an end centuries before the end of the world: that were disintegrated centuries before the Stone yet unfallen could have fallen to crush them. In the Apocalypse respecting the overthrow of Jerusalem which the Redeemer gave to His four apostles, and respecting also the destruction of the world, the Christian consciousness, so to speak, after first identifying, soon learned to distinguish the figure and the fact; and the Church refused any longer to regard the smouldering ruins of Jerusalem as answering the description of the wreck and ruin of a demolished universe. The progress of the ages forces on us the same distinction with regard to the revelations of Daniel. We must separate in our thoughts, as God in history has separated in fact, the *application*, which may be recurrent from the final fulfilment of the vision. It is trifling with the sanctity of history, as well as of revelation, to reckon the kingdoms 'down to the destruction of the world' as only the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. It is mere quibbling to affirm that the Roman empire continues to this day, because the nations of Europe, or of European origin, continue to call the months of the year by Roman names, and have moulded their jurisprudence on the principles of the Perpetual Edict. Prophecy forewarns us of what will in time become history, and time interprets the language of the future. The Roman empire, which centuries ago had ceased to be a fact, about sixty years ago ceased to be even a figure of speech, when the emperor sunk into an Emperor of Austria. Time, the divine expositor, thus frees us from the influence of two traditions. In the first place, the ὁ κατέχων and the τὸ κατέχων cannot have been the Roman empire; in the second place, the Roman empire, as the supposed fourth kingdom, having ceased to exist in any legitimate or recognisable sense of the term before the final coming of the Son of Man, cannot be the Roman empire of the prophecy. Whether existing as political or spiritual antagonists, the old empires were not, either in succession or combination, annihilated at the first advent of the Son of God. In what sense at this day the Collect in the Missal, praying for the Roman empire, is offered up, we cannot say. The territories which for the most part formed the original dominion of republican Rome remain to this hour united under the sovereignty of the Supreme Pontiff. So long as<sup>1</sup> the Roman

<sup>1</sup> The notion that S. Paul, for prudential reasons, kept back the name of the Roman, when speaking of the "letting" power, is flagrantly out of keeping with the decorum of Scripture. The ruin of Italy and the empire was an idea familiar to the thoughts of men as early, at least, as the days of Horace. Suetonius and

Church remains faithful to her divine deposit, so long will the truth she embodies and represents be too much for the insurgent powers of evil that surround her; and it will let and will continue to let. When a bishop of Rome, abandoning the faith—as more than one of his predecessors have done—and making his league with the powers of the world, shall be ‘beginning to sink,’ Christendom may then be called to witness the rapid construction and development of the last world-empire, spreading in the strength of demon power, and exhibiting as its dread ruler the enemy of the Lord Jesus. In this sense, then, and to this extent, the Church may well pray the prayer of the Missal in the Good Friday collect for the Roman dominion; that it may be preserved, and that it may be purified. We have tried exposure and denunciation long enough. Instead of weeping a sister’s fault, bewailing our own frailty, and importuning the erring loved one to return, we have only steeped our thoughts in wormwood, we have hardened ourselves against the instincts of our better nature, we have clothed our lips with vituperative and rancorous declamation. Suppose that now, in addition to prayer to God for her, we beseech that Church herself to consider the perils of the age, which touch her so much more nearly than they do any other part of Christendom; suppose that, urging her with the conclusions of her own most cherished expositors, we implore her to think of her latter end, and by a timely reformation delay, at least, the crisis of apostasy. We might, it is true, fail to weary her into acquiescence, but at least this consolation would be left us, we should know that we had at last discharged the long-delayed debt of love.

If these remarks possess any weight, we can see at once how far we may accept that human exposition of the prophet’s visions which the Church has too unquestioningly received from the synagogue. That political and territorial organization which—the *débris* of foregone imperial constitutions—will constitute the *materiel* of the kingdom of Antichrist, will appropriate to itself and eventually style itself by the name of Rome. The four kingdoms, as they are popularly regarded, are the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. The Apocalyptic significance of the kingdoms is wholly derived

---

Tacitus, not long after the martyrdom of S. Paul, communicated to their reader the pretensions of the Jews to supersede the sovereignty of Rome, and the Pseudo-Sybilline oracle anticipated by half a century the hesitating guess of Irenæus. The reserve of Josephus, on the like topic, was dictated by a seasonable timidity, which we cannot bring ourselves to believe could have been experienced by S. Paul; which, with him, would have been *unseasonable*, as the secret in the main was, if not already, yet in a few years was to be, proclaimed in the ears of the Roman power.

from their having been employed as instruments to work out the will of God, in the chastening of the chosen people, and the demolition of the chosen city. Nation and state fell under the judgment of God. *Until the coming of the Stone* only one of the three kingdoms scourged the people of God, and laid waste the sanctuary. A representative and distant successor of Alexander, long after the disintegration of the Greek empire, tormented the people and polluted the sanctuary for a term of three years.<sup>1</sup> The third kingdom was to 'bear rule over the whole earth.' The whole earth must be at least Asia. But the Euphrates was the frontier of the Roman dominions, and the Indus was the frontier of the ephemeral empire of Alexander. The power of Babylon scattered the Jews, and destroyed their place for seventy years. The power of Rome, a kingdom that arose as Babylon declined, was the next to scatter the nation and keep Jerusalem desolate; and this she did for six hundred years. Thus the Old and New Babylon stand side by side, in historical as well as spiritual juxtaposition. What kingdom succeeded the Roman? The empire of Mahomet, as an empire possessing dominions in Asia, has existed longer than the Roman; it has survived the Roman—a great part of the Roman empire has merged into it; it has held for 1,200 years that foredoomed city of Zion, over which it watches at this hour. Indirectly and directly the Arabian power has proved itself the last great public tormentor of the Jews: indirectly, by originating the Crusades; directly, wherever they were reached by its conquering arms. The historian tells us how the obstinacy of the Jews converted the partiality of Mahomet 'into implacable hatred, 'with which he pursued that unfortunate people to the last 'moment of his life; and in the double character of an apostle 'and a conqueror, his persecution was extended to both worlds.'<sup>2</sup> We do not read that the high priest gratified his victorious visitor with an exposition of that part of the dream-image which is popularly interpreted of the Greek empire. From the inference that he did not, we conclude that he believed he could not extract, with any truth, anything to flatter and gratify Alexander from the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. And yet, if the third part of that image does apply to Alexander, how much more

<sup>1</sup> In the eighth chapter of Daniel the vision of the ram and he-goat is expounded by the Holy Spirit. Can we, then, with due regard to the method of Scripture, believe that *unexpounded* parts of the image symbolize again, in breast and arms, and belly and thighs, these same kingdoms? Are we not rather led to conclude that, inasmuch as these empires were not persecutors of God's ancient people (but rather were its patrons and protectors), and are fully represented in a later, they cannot be supposed to form a part of the earlier vision, which still remains uninterpreted?

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, chap. 1.

encouraging and inspiriting is the oracle, which says of that kingdom, it 'shall bear rule over all the earth.' All the characteristics of the kingdom, on the other hand, meet in the Mohammedan dominion. To this hour the liege subjects of Mahomet are encamped throughout all Asia, and occupy what might be the very paradise of Europe. Now we do not forget that we are not writing an exposition. Our aim is to free the Book of Daniel from 'a band of iron and brass,' which keeps it unfruitful 'in the tender grass' of the Church. Our attempted application may be in itself no better than, or not half as good as, the old; but it has this one advantage—instead of relegating to the past, it lifts up, to the interest of the present hour, one of the most marvellous of all the revelations of God. It is calculated to fix the attention of the Church on two important objects,—upon Rome, every political vicissitude of which (and the immediate future is thronged with such) is portentous and full of warning: upon Mohammedanism, which never, save on Good Friday, engages the prayers of the Church; and which, now that it has resumed its missionary labours, may be expected to break out at any time in all its desolating fanaticism. And, lastly, this application of these visions—let it be no more than application—enables the thoughtful Christian to read aright all the political secrets of the world. He knows how the first kingdom merged into the second, and the second into the third. He knows that the third will be continued on into a fourth, which, incorporating all the rest, and readjusting, will equip itself with the old imperial properties, which in their present dismembered condition lie scattered over the surface of the political world: he knows how, directing all its earliest energies against the 'Eternal City,' it will clothe itself with the Roman name, and shall prosper till the Stone descending grind it to powder, and it be swept away 'like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors.' Thus Daniel ceases to be the mere historian of the past; he becomes what he is, the seer and prophet of the present and the future, one to keep alive the mind and reason, and the whole regenerated intellect of the Church of God.<sup>1</sup>

II. As to the ethical uses of the book of Daniel, it is not overstating it to affirm that no book of Scripture dwells at greater length upon, or exhibits in a plainer light, the godlessness of the world, the congenital corruption of earthly power. Warnings

<sup>1</sup> In the richness of His mercy God has given to His Church two seers, S. John as well as Daniel. But we must not leave out of sight the interest in the book of Daniel, which will be possessed to the last by the unevangelized remnant of the disinherited Israel. In the final travail of that afflicted race we may well believe that Daniel, consummating the type-likeness to Joseph which he already bears, will fulfil the type-likeness he also bears to Moses, and will lead back to the Mount of God the long-alienated tribes.

scattered through the rest of Scripture against mistaking created and permitted force for Divine authority, are concentrated and intensified in the teaching of the book of Daniel. It is a beautiful and consolatory lesson which the prophet gives us, showing us the love of God to His exiled Church, and the tender solicitude of the Most High devising means that His banished be not expelled from Him. There are many noble examples of unperturbed sanctity and inviolable faith sketched by the pen of the prophet. But the distinctive lesson of the book is this: that neither the glare of temporal splendour and success; nor occasional acknowledgments of Him that is invisible; nor even revelations of the Most High in visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon man—none of these things can regenerate human greatness. Earth-born magnificence is of the world; and continues worldly to the last. Human power, as regarded by and as acting on the world, may differ as much in character and interior worth as the iron and the gold; but to the purged vision of the seers of God it evermore appears as a living organization, indeed, but essentially bestial in itself—without a spirit, without a conscience, without a God. This truth all the Churches of Western Christendom need to have constantly enforced upon them. Latin Christianity, in all its branches, has been subjected to laws and usages of mere human origination. Every apostolic Church of the West is bound up or identified with secular institutions and territorial securities, and so obviously fenced, established, and upheld by temporal laws as to keep out of sight, and so unhappily too often out of mind, the foundation laid once for all in the Rock of our salvation. We believe our own Church suffers less from this evil than any other of the Churches of the West; but still she suffers very grievously from the encroachments of that state which, by her union with, she consecrates, and which she saves by her holiness from moral and political decomposition. Our empire may boast of its military prowess, of its immense area, and its intelligent and well-ordered populations. But God's Church is no longer maintained as conterminous with its rule. The profession of the Christian faith has come to be regarded as an accident, not as of the essence of the Constitution. The notorious compact theory, which denies the '*jus divinum*' in the State, is as old as Ulpian, is 'false in itself, and slavish in its consequences;' and its recognition among ourselves has paved the way to the denial of the '*jus divinum*' in the Church. Take away that 'letting power,' and the deluge of ungodliness will succeed. What the powers of the redeemed Nature should be, what they shall be, we are taught in the cherubic splendours of Ezekiel. The wild beasts of Daniel reveal the true nature and the certain

destiny of all the political organizations of the world. The peculiar temptations of all the Western Churches give an especial emphasis to the warning thus conveyed. Where the Church is content to derive her strength and defence from the State, and devoid of higher yearnings loves to have it so, there we shall be sure to find the State coercing and obstructing the Church. There we shall be sure to find the Church full of fears, and ripe for compromise, and ready to commit fornication with the kings of the earth. Enough. The criticism of infidelity indirectly does the faith a great service by calling the Church to the defence of forgotten strongholds, and thus bringing her face to face with the records of her destiny; and thus the inspired Magian will remind her afresh of the cross she is called to bear, but has scarcely yet in our day learned to understand, and the true character of the world in which she spends her exile. The purple in which governments array her is but a robe of mockery. She is a Bride without her Lord, a Queen without her crown. But through the clouds of sorrow she can look up with Daniel, and descry the everlasting firmament, glowing with her risen saints. One in sorrow and rebuke with her Lord, she can drink in with a higher longing the assurances of eternal hope. 'Non semper pendebit Christus inter latrones. Resurget aliquando Crucifixa Veritas.'

---



ART. II.—*A Handbook of Rome*. Seventh Edition. London : John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1864.

*L'Eglise et La Société Chrétiennes en 1861*. Par M. GUIZOT. Paris. 1861.

THE Roman Question is as old and garrulous as any of those many other questions which shed stars and ribbons on diplomatists and desperation on the readers of the daily papers. But even the dullest drama of life is sure of one true tragic touch at dying ; and if the issue and catastrophe of any subject can exact attention, our attention may well be attracted, now at all events, to Rome. But, indeed, the Roman question, unlike its Scandinavian or Turkish contemporaries, though worn, is not threadbare, nor well can be. Not a page of history but bears upon it the name of Rome ; the works of Rome, past and present, are a permanent cause which we can never eliminate from the acts of any European nation, and which, it may well be supposed, will remain a cause or a condition in the history of the future, as they have been and are in that of the past and of the present. There is one clue leading us from the old to the new ages, not of Christendom, but of the world,—one chain, and one only, which, older than Christendom itself, makes us feel ourselves inheritors of all the past. There is a unity in the history of Rome, imperial and papal, which binds thousands of years together. When Rome has slipped, if ever it is to be, from the relaxing grasp of the Papacy, when the popes (for Papacy, though there planted, has other roots now than at Rome) shall fulminate from Avignon, from Malta, from the Balearic Isles, or from Barcelona, then the last link of the chain joining the ancient world to the dark ages of Christendom, the dark ages to the era of steam-engines and steam-ploughs, will have snapt at last, and the European consciousness will be certainly feebler and poorer by a treasury of then meaningless associations closed to it for ever ; but who can predict that it will be freer and franker by the need of looking only to the future, or watching only over the present ? The change or revolution when, if ever, it does come, will be great indeed ; so great, that every one, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, ought to prepare his mind for its advent, and, considering what destruction it will cause to old ideas, to ponder what substitutes can be found in the new.

The time ought to be full ripe for the solution of this vast

question. The Schleswig-Holstein question is dead and decently buried, but not the more decently for the fact that Europe suffered it to drift on to quicksands, and thus break up. The stage of Europe is now free from that gloomy, dimly outlined drama, and the managers of such spectacles for the European public seem to have determined that the Roman question must next make its appearance. Two small parties are ready and prepared for it, with their opposed quotas of alternate denunciation. But what will the great mass of Christendom do? Which side will it take? Does it know what the problems are which are proposed for its solution—how many in number—of what gravity and moment? Does it see that it is a local Italian question—that, again, it is a great question of European morality and international law? That it is a secular question, *pur et simple*—that it is a religious question, *pur et simple*—that it is both together, and neither *pur et simple*? Was there ever such a many-headed hydra as this—ever such a question which shifts and shifts about, with a pertinacious idiosyncrasy of its own, yet capable of being turned at the touch of any dexterous partisan, so as to show to any possible foe the aspect which is least likely to awaken his hostility or even his interest. Men at large seem neither to know the phases of this mysterious question, nor generally to feel disposed even to *wish*, much less to *will*, in the matter.

It is not only Protestants who have as yet been slow to marshal their opinions on this great Roman question: foreign Roman Catholics themselves still hold aloof from either side. They have hitherto regarded the question as political only, as one affecting the relations of different Italian states, and not of European nations. *They* have been in the habit for centuries of distinguishing the diverse characters of the pope, as a spiritual and as a temporal prince. It remains to be seen what attitude they will assume when they find, as a consequence of political revolution, the head of their Church either an exile, or else turned into a courtier of Victor Emmanuel. Yet, for all the Roman Catholic world is doing, this is the alternative. For consider what the victory of the Italians implies, unless indeed the pope and cardinals should change their minds and quietly abdicate on conditions. Consider also what it equally implies if they refuse to abdicate, and, interposing, not to say an active armed resistance, simply a dogged obstinacy, take refuge behind a steadfast 'non possumus.' In the former case, those whom Catholic Europe and America recognise as oracles, as the centres of religious pomps and pageants, will themselves occupy, and without the glory of voluntary martyrdom, the position of refugees ever plotting to recover their lost possessions. In the other case,

what an anomaly at one and the same time to be the ecclesiastical officers of a constitutional kingdom, and to arrogate the ecclesiastical sovereignty over a score of other nations.

The fact is, that the loud rumours of the actual results of the papal temporal sovereignty at Rome are a terror and a bugbear in the path of Catholics with ever so feeble a consciousness of men's rights to honest government, which, whatever the truth, scare candid minds from an inquiry which they fear might end in forcing them to choose between playing the friend of tyranny, or the foe to their own Church. Really these reports of misgovernment have been exaggerated. The pontifical rule, at least as compared with that of its neighbours, has usually been neither *very* good nor *very* bad; its position, as the centre of Christendom, having preserved it in some measure from those sudden alternations of administration to which states, like Tuscany and Modena, preserved by their very pettiness from dependence on the public opinion of Europe, have always been exposed. It has always been remarked, even in busy England, that ecclesiastical estates have been less liable to change of management than those of laymen. Exactly the same causes, viz. the incapacity for strict and regular superintendence, the carelessness about advantages which would be reaped, not by themselves, but by their successors; and, finally, the engrossing of the active powers of the mind by different pursuits, which appear the real labours of life, have ever operated to keep the States of the Church in that sort of galvanized vitality which now rouses the wrath and indignation of Italian patriots, as much as ever did the regulated tyranny of the despot of Naples, or the mad Mimi-Neronism of Duke Francis of Modena.

The real defect and vice in the pontifical government is one which, unfortunately for the permanence of that *régime*, cannot be removed by virtuous self-denial on the part of its administrators, or be much aggravated even by a bad election. Its weakness is inseparable from its very essence as being a government owing a twofold allegiance, to the public opinion both of the Catholic world, and also of its own states. It must, from its nature, be dependent for its duration either on the help of foreign countries, or on the indulgence, rather than the loyalty, of its native subjects. It is impossible that such a sovereign should represent his people even in the same vague way in which the Czar of all the Russias is the impersonation of his vast empire; for in one, and that the grander aspect of his character, he is not specially the lord of Rome, but of a dozen other lands. What security can there be for the sympathy of a people with a ruler whose subjects and constituents range over half the globe?

How can such a power ensure obedience to its policy from subjects whose demands for reform and legislation it is obliged to repel by the excuse (and a valid one, too, in its position) of its double character? And when discontents arise, as arise they will at times in all governments, how can such a potentate reconcile the meekness and unworldliness of its priestly *persona* with the need for the haughtiness of a monarch and the craft of a diplomatist? How, lastly, should the popular requisitions prove irresistible, can an infallible priest condescend to own himself a fallible and confuted prince?

This preliminary question respecting the character and possibilities of the Papal temporal government seems to be something beyond which many minds find themselves totally unable to pass. It appears to them a thing unquestionable that it is the indefensible right of the Roman States to be under an administration which shall be their own, and not an administration with aims and needs, it may be, more exalted than theirs, but at any rate not theirs—an administration which, in deference to its character of Italian prince, sends an army to the gates of Milan, and then, as one of its most violent partisans glories in relating, declares that its sovereign cannot, being pontiff, proclaim war against any Christian Power. Candid and liberally nurtured minds, though sturdily Catholic, do not like to deny it to be the right of any country to have its resources developed to the utmost, and to see the profits of that development, whether great or small, spent on itself, and on itself alone, except so far as it may itself consent to their employment on more extended objects. But Roman Catholics, with these convictions, are confronted by the apparent certainty that the effect of carrying such premisses to their legitimate conclusions will be a convulsion and revolution in the whole of their religious system; they can discover no clear alternative to a disastrous theory which would seem, as often handled, to imply, however strange and astounding the doctrine, that Providence has set apart and marked out one division of Europe as a scapegoat for the benefit of collective Christianity.

So long as the champions of the two extreme parties keep in their own respective positions, each is impregnable. But, at the same time, neither advances his own cause a single step. The friend of a free and united Italy, so long as he is drawing from his copious store of facts showing that there has been direful misgovernment and mismanagement at Rome, cannot be dislodged from his position that a system, of which such are the fruits, is entitled to no man's sympathy, or, at all events, to no man's aid. But unfortunately for his cause, so long as his adversary, the champion of the temporal powers of the Papacy,

likewise shelters himself behind his ramparts, and can point to the dearest pledges of Catholic Christendom's traditions, faith, and piety, which, whether with propriety or dishonesty, but, at any rate, with much worldly wisdom, he has managed to entrap and detain within his camp, and thus to expose to the very same dangers and terrors which threaten himself, his cause also is for the time safe. While the former bids the liberal Roman Catholic remember that, in assisting actively the Papacy, he will be warring against others' freedom, for which, if menaced in his own person, he would fight to the death; the latter appeals to him—Your strength may turn the scale and drive us out, but your own religious instincts will then be homeless too. Thus each side is content with evading destruction, and exultant in a reprieve which ought to be more shocking to them than death. Each is too prejudiced, too vengeful, too little generous, to feel that its opponent's chief security consists in the pity and perplexity which third parties feel at the very certainty of its destruction if once dislodged, and that, accordingly, its own endeavour should be to build a bridge of gold for the enemy to flee across. Instead of M. About and his Italian admirers, such as Signor Petruccelli della Gattina, on the one side, striving to demonstrate that every pope must be, *quâ* pope, a tyrant and a bigot, and every cardinal, *quâ* cardinal, a tyrant and a debauchee, and instead of the Ultramontanist urging that the Court and heart of the Roman Catholic Church should be not national but European, it would far more promote their respective aims for the one to show that ecclesiastical independence is compatible with deprivation of temporal sovereignty, and for the other to prove, if possible, that it has been the mere accident of circumstance that the spiritual supremacy in Europe has appeared to involve the ruin of the happiness of three millions of Christians. As it is, the arguments of the two opposed parties make clear to us two points, and two only, viz. that it ought to be impossible for Christians to sympathize either with the compulsory sacrifice of the three millions of Papal subjects to the alleged good of Christianity, or so long at least as the Roman Catholic Church is to remain a Church, with the sacrifice of the freedom of communication, the European, non-provincial, non-national tone of the head and centre of the Church with its branches. We feel the grandeur and splendour, the magnificence of the idea of the King-Priesthood, the independence (alas! only in theory) of all selfish pecuniary motives in the relations between the pontiff and foreign Catholics which his rich States ought to, but hitherto never have, secured to him, and the noble field he has in them for exhibiting before the eyes of Europe the spectacle of a sove-

reignty free from earthly motives, and administered without any reference to the balance of trade or the balance of power. But if the conscience of ecclesiastical sovereigns is so sensitive that it forces them to do all the government themselves, and to keep their subjects in leading-strings, lest with the energies of manhood they should display some of its vices; if the real objects of their temporal administration are Austrian concordats, Rhenish mixed-marriage laws, Irish Repeal, Poland, the Sandwich Islands, anything, in short, but the malaria steaming up and stealing up from the Basilica of S. Paul to the slopes of Frascati,—anything but the sewers of Tivoli, the brigands of Ceprano, or the nightly brawls and midnight murders in the very shadow of S. Peter's,—then, indeed, whether the silent buffalo-driver know or not what a death in life his existence is, whether or not the curiosity-shop keeper be enthusiastic for pope and cardinals, whether or not the bankrupt prince, with his eyes on the cardinalate for a younger son, be fierce against changes, yet, all the same, changes ought to come, and changes must come. And so with the other side of the picture—if the Italian patriot desires for his country a national Church, and not one common to him and all European Catholics; if he is resolute to remain a Roman Catholic and not to turn to Protestantism; if he is determined to keep the luxury of a *Supreme Pontiff* for Italy, and have him, in fact, the Minister of Public Worship in the Ministry of the King of Italy; then, whether or not such a state of things would be better for Italy than the present, whether or not, as an Italian, he demand that to which he has theoretically a right;—at any rate, he demands an impossibility, an incongruity, a change which, if thorough enough to satisfy him, cannot fail to dissatisfy the rest of Catholic Europe. A result according with either hypothesis is equally absurd; one result is not a jot more absurd than the other. For think of the scandal of the alleged paternal rule of the pontiff spurned at and abhorred by the nearest spectators of it in action, of men made moral and virtuous by the help of the rifle and the bayonet. What an encouragement is *there* for all despots over the world, from the military governor in Poland to the tyrant-pedant mandarin in China: think, above all, of the devouring cancer in the breast of that Church itself, teaching patience and resignation abroad, but never practising it at home. But then, again, would not the results be equally eccentric on the second hypothesis; with what gratitude might we picture welcomed at Schönbrunn the arrival of a Bull with the imprimatur on it of the Cabinet of Turin or the Pitti!

But we have said it ought to be impossible for Christians to sympathize heartily, and without reserve, either with the en-



forced submission of Roman citizens, or with the Procrustean cutting down of the world-wide aims of the Papacy to the standard of Italian policy. That English Churchmen, equally with, or even in a greater degree than Roman Catholics, might find the former impossible, is apparent enough: but there are reasons why it should be so with them in the latter case also (though let them not expect that aid in return, to which M. Guizot looks). Exeter Hall may, perhaps, feel a serene satisfaction in the incongruities and inconsistencies of Italian Catholics: that so many towns are lost to the pope may appear, in the bold logic which is ventilated within those highly excitable precincts, but another form of saying that just in the same degree the territories of Protestantism are enlarged. This is a very common, but a most extraordinary delusion. It would be well, indeed, for Italy, could it be persuaded on religious and theological grounds to change Romanism for Italianism: but, at present, any changes which it has subscribed to have been due to political motives alone. A member of the Church of Rome is playing with edged tools when he contemns and spurns at the character and authority of the pope: it is worse than foolish for the members of other Churches to triumph in a state of things which makes brother Christians outlaws from their own Church without bringing them one step forward on their difficult way toward any other. The disease, too, in this case of Italy, exhibits itself in an aggravated form. It is not as though the whole nation had resolved upon a change of its relations to its priesthood, and had carried out the revolution so far and so far only as it had predetermined. In such case, things would have gradually accommodated themselves, and the old sanctions would have been accepted in reference to new conditions. As it is, not merely is the Italian land divided by the quarrel respecting the temporal sovereignty of the popes, but it is the same with every city, and almost with every house. The casual tourist, though he visit churches, not to worship, but to gaze on pictures, knows this well. It is not proved by the fact that in the towns a man is but seldom seen in a church, while women crowd there—for the same phenomenon is apparent in any part of France, except Brittany—it is that the deadly feud which rages between the educated classes in Italy and the Head of their Church, seems not to have made the slightest impression on the women of cities, or the men of the country. When class is thus separated from class by an utter discord of hope, feeling, and sensibility as to the infinity of ideas and motives comprehended in religion, there is anarchy in the very life of a nation. The wife looks upon her husband as a cast-away; the peasant, on his periodical visits to the city fair or

market, regards the burgher as one without religion or honesty; while, on the other hand, the father, husband, or brother, suspects those dearest to him of being unconscious traitors in the bosom of the family, and the citizens despise the farmer and look on themselves as the only true Italians.

If the breaking up of homes and of provinces in Italy be not judged a valid pretext why Englishmen should interest themselves in a Continental question, at least the consequent menace of great European convulsions must be accepted as a sufficient excuse. The very same species of discord and mutual antipathy, or, at any rate, want of sympathy which is distracting Italy, is radiating in every direction throughout Catholic Europe. Nations become suspicious of each other—orthodox Austria of quasi-heretical Italy and France. In any one nation, too, there is the same sort of disunity as in any one Italian province; and everywhere alike in Catholic lands, women and men, peasants and burghers, the uneducated and the educated, get drawn into two different camps. There can be nothing worse than such a state of things which thus, while not being of a nature to bring persons within the pale of another Church, excommunicates and makes pariahs of them within their own; which, based on a quarrel respecting the temporal rights arrogated by the ministers of religion, induces these latter to intrench themselves, and those temporal rights, behind their sacred functions, tempting in turn reckless opponents to lead a storming party over the carcass of their own faith.

The worst of the matter is, that either side has a real grievance. Though we could pick and cull circumstances at our pleasure to suit any theory we might select, still the victory of either party could not fail to imply the meting out of a large portion of something like injustice to the other. In Italy at large, men have an abstract right to a free circulation of ideas throughout the whole of a nation which has vindicated its nationality by vitality through its many centuries of political disunion: in the Roman States in particular, men have a right to a government which shall sympathize with the common life of mankind, which shall not have the interests of two diverse characters to reconcile, and which shall use the resources of the country for the development of the country itself. But, on the other hand, in Italy the priesthood and their adherents are equally entitled to refuse to become mere functionaries of a State which will expect them, the members of a society which knows no nationalities, to take for enemies those who are not *their* enemies, and for friends those who are not *their* friends; and, in other Catholic lands, it may be in France, it may be in Austria, the Catholic party are equally entitled to murmur at the Italianizing and isolating of

the heads of *their* Church, at the poisoning with suspicion of political intrigues the very fountain of Catholicism. Which of the opposed grievances will be finally relieved, and which will remain to fester and to corrupt the body of Europe and Christendom, must be long uncertain. At present it appears as though the States of the Church were drifting into the sea of Italian nationality: for if the French troops once leave Rome, it will be hard to persuade the French people of the policy of recalling them, whatever the liberty reserved by the Emperor of intervention in case of an internal revolution in the Papal capital. But the cession to the Italian kingdom of that wondrous city, which not so much nature as the tyranny of History has marked out for its capital, is a Cadmean victory, unless with it are bent in willing submission the stubborn wills of prelates, cardinals, and pope. Unless a far deeper revolution than there are at present any signs of, rage throughout the mind of Italy, there is no hope for religious peace in that country, unless under the auspices of Roman Catholicism. Such religion as yet lingers there, having escaped the storms of prejudice and political partisanship, is still Roman Catholicism; and for the Italian Government to accept Rome without the Church of Rome would be like taking an empty eagle's nest, and thereby scaring away the parent birds to some more inaccessible fastness.

But should this peril be avoided, should the approaches of the Italian Government be so guarded, so wary, that the Papacy should suddenly wake up to find itself transformed into the State Church of Italy, then how would it fare with the rest of Roman Catholic Europe? What Italy would gain (and it would, we confess, gain much), just so much, for the time at any rate, would France, Austria, and the rest lose or think they lost. A Colonna might in bygone ages lord it over a supreme pontiff; and yet, without any apparent absurdity, that pontiff's mandates be received as very oracles of Heaven in the Court of Warsaw, or the *Ultima Thule* of Britain: but it would be a ludicrous caprice of fancy to picture to oneself a French bishop, even him of Orleans, asserting against the representative of French nationality the ecclesiastical pre-eminence of an ecclesiastical courtier of a foreign king, perhaps one who was, with his twenty millions of subjects, a successful combatant of French ideas in the councils of Europe. It seems, it is true, that some sanguine persons fondly hope that the conversion of Rome into the Italian metropolis is compatible with the Papacy's independence of Italian nationality. The hypothesis is, that the Italian Parliament may jubilantly debate in the Capitol on the secularization of monasteries, or war with Austria, and, at the

same time, cardinals and pope hold independent council in the Vatican on the promulgation of new articles of faith, the founding of new orders of monks, or the excommunication of the despoilers of the old. What an inconceivable chimera would this appear, only that it has been conceived! And yet, if the hopes of Italians be fulfilled, as in all probability they will be, this impossible event is the only possible alternative and chance of escape from one of two great evils. For else either must Italy, on the one hand, become for years, it may be for centuries, should the Papacy exile itself from the land of its birth, a land in which religion would be a thing but half recognised, and a deliberate plotter against the established constitution in things political; or, on the other hand, must the rest of Roman Catholic Europe, should the Papacy not so exile itself, but be persuaded to accept the same sort of character which Henry VIII. imposed upon the English Church, hazard falling into the condition of the faithful in the Ten Tribes after Jeroboam's revolt had made the Temple foreign soil, and the priesthood strangers and foes.

A third course once was possible: probably it is so no longer. The temporal sovereignty of the pope seems doomed, and, we frankly confess, rightly so, not because it has always hitherto been conspicuously behind other Italian States in energy and moderation—for on the whole, taking a couple of centuries together, it has, we must repeat, been less corrupt, more paternal than its neighbours—but because its very principle is that it should be at once paternal to the full extent of that, for governments, terribly false analogy, and at the same time persistently careless of developing the resources of its territories, because too lavish of energy abroad to care for anything but rest at home. Thus, now, the world seems to have settled down into the unalterable conviction that the temporal power of the Papacy must cease. It is not clearly the fact indeed that its subjects themselves demand their freedom, or incorporation into the Italian kingdom with anything approaching unanimity: the noblesse, and a considerable part of the bourgeoisie and plebs of Rome, are even vehement adherents of the Papal rule, while the peasants are careless of opposing it: but it is clearly the fact that every step towards the fuller realization of Italian unity will, from the mere force of commercial interest, and the contagion of neighbourhood, produce an increasing desire at all events for self-government, and for a constitution analogous to, and in sympathy with, that of the rest of their country. But it was not always, whatever it may now be, a necessary consequence, that the remnants of the States of the Church, or at any rate, that the City of Rome and its dependent Campagna and

hills, should, because they cannot but pass from the direct sovereignty of the popes, be therefore incorporated into the as yet ill-fused Italian kingdom. There was, and indeed still is, in these States, a machinery by which an intermediate result might have been arrived at by way of compromise. All over Italy, from wealthy Bologna down to the smallest shrunken town perched half way up some spur of the Apennines, there has ever existed, lingering even to the present day, and defying the attacks of cardinals and dukes, of a Napoleon and of a Metternich, the obstinately ineradicable *municipal* spirit. The Papacy, finding that it could not extirpate it from its dominions, has always recognised it more or less, and has even utilized it. This spirit might have been encouraged and developed, and, finally, have had the temporal sceptre of the pontiff handed over to its guardianship. From such a stake-holder there could neither have arisen, nor have been feared, any peril, either to the Italian kingdom, lest it would be a dangerous neighbour, or to Italian unity, lest it should impede the free current of trade and sympathies throughout the entire length and breadth of the land. Finally, Catholicism at large could not have dreaded that such a potentate would be powerful or wilful enough to tamper with the cosmopolitanism and independence of the Papacy as an ecclesiastical sovereignty, or to make it, or suffer it to be made, into a tool and instrument of any political party.

Such independence is all that the Catholic world has in its own interests a right to demand for the Papacy; and it is in effect only because the temporal rule has been hitherto, in the actual condition of Italy, the readiest way of securing such independence for the Church, that the dogma "*Il faut que les deux pouvoirs soient confondus dans l'État Romain pour qu'ils soient séparés dans le reste du monde*," has been recognised as containing any truth. It is *not* as though the interest of the Church demands, or ever did demand, that its Head should have a toy state wherein to play at realizing an impossible ideal of a material sovereignty over the conscience, or that the right to tax three millions of Italians (with the result of producing a clear revenue, Mr. Maguire says, of £1000 only), is the single specific for maintaining the dignity of religion in the person of its chief. Again, such a levelling of all barriers between the sympathies of the Roman States and the rest of Italy as might be effected by the medium of this municipal independence, a grant of liberty to all Roman citizens, Italians in their character, to feel themselves members of the same nation, though, while residing in Rome and its environs, chancing to live under a rather more independent municipal

constitution than that enjoyed by Turin, or by Florence, is all that, as a matter of abstract right, or of fact, the Italian nation on its part is entitled to require. That because Parma, and Florence, and Naples, and Milan, have chosen to resign their provincial independence, and to adopt one identical constitution, therefore *they* have a right to demand that Rome should be given up to them for their capital (and their position, it must be remarked, assumes such right totally independent of any wish to that effect being expressed by the Romans themselves whatever the case in this respect may be), is simply and absolutely preposterous. What can be a stranger distortion of reasoning than to argue that, because once Rome had a right to the rest of Italy, therefore now the rest of Italy has a right to Rome? The whole is a novel demand, a novel idea, a sort of Rip Van Winkle-like ignoring of their own long denationalized lethargy, and the result of a picturesque though rather ridiculous fancy that the Roman Commonwealth has never come to an end, and that it has been simply in trust for Italy—that the metropolitan character of Rome has been nursed through the long centuries since Attila and Alaric by the king-prelates, whose personal pretensions are now so indignantly spurned.

It is, in fact, an historical blunder to suppose that the other provinces of Italy have any title to determine on the political future of the Roman States; at least any right beyond the right, based on the law of self-preservation, to a material guarantee that the constitution and *régime* of those States shall not be such as to make them a firebrand or a pesthouse in the centre of Italy. The only *necessary* parties to a convention which should involve the resignation by the popes of their temporal sovereignty into the hands of a native Roman secular municipality, entitled to stand in the same relation to Italy as Hamburg or Frankfurt to Germany, would be the Papal Court and the Romans themselves. To such a compromise, as the only resource at hand against dependence on the Italian Court on the one hand, or hopeless exile on the other, with the additional bitter reflection that, in the latter event, it, the spiritual Head of Catholic Europe, was endangering the religious convictions of many millions of Italians, it might reasonably be expected that, however reluctantly, the Papal Court would at last consent. That the Romans should, on their part, acquiesce in an arrangement which would preserve for the tradesmen their ecclesiastical customers, for the nobles their ecclesiastical traditions, court, and patronage, for the middle-classes their rights of self-government immensely developed and well guaranteed, and which would secure for the peasants some relief from the ever growing weight of taxes, levied as they are, to keep off an ever present and ever growing danger, without



terrifying them by any too apparent or sudden changes or innovations, might as reasonably be expected.

The material advantages which would result from an arrangement which would give the Romans most of the personal benefits of political freedom, while securing them in some measure from the burdens of foreign wars and of diplomatic complications, in which the rest of Italy, as now become an important member of the European council, will surely have (though with the compensatory satisfaction of having a voice in imposing its own burdens) to bear its part, and in the first place to pay its footing, would probably be accepted, after some coy reserve, as no insufficient substitute for the Florentine's or Neapolitan's costly consciousness of full Italian citizenship.

In considering this question it is immaterial whether it be the fact, as alleged by Mr. Maguire ('*Rome, Its Ruler, and Its Institutions*'), and other Ultramontanist writers, that no city in the world surpasses Rome in the number and efficiency of its public charities and endowments, the energy of goodwill with which the government endeavours to provide against deception and indolence on the part of subordinates, and, in general, in the signs of sympathy with all the wants and sufferings of humanity. It is even immaterial whether or not the object of Italian liberals would be in effect attained by the fall of the great power of the Papacy. Grant that they are mistaken; grant that the kindness of public administration is not merely great at Rome, but great relatively to other States, and that a defender of the worst possible governmental system in Europe would not be enabled to make out a numerical catalogue of philanthropic institutions (the necessary and spontaneous growth of any form of European civilization) which would overwhelm the memory and almost the reason of the most confirmed liberal; grant, finally, that it can be perfectly well explained why this exceptionally wise, and sagacious, and painstaking government has been so singularly unfortunate in results—why it has not brought the Trastevere to moderate its addiction to assassination, or its nobles, that trace their lineage to the mighty Republic, to live as though life were not the one sole object of life; yet, assuming all this to be, as it is argued, a proof that the Papal rule is the best rule which the Papal States could enjoy, it does not go in the least to the real root of the question, which is, whether the people themselves for whom the government is needed are satisfied with it, and not, whether they would be temporally wise to exchange their right, as subjects of Papal Rome, to the awe and veneration of Christendom, for the position of the Washington of the Italian kingdom.

If their submission be not voluntary, but enforced, it is the obvious policy of an institution with so lofty a character as the Papacy, to endeavour to escape from that tyrant attitude which, compromising even to great England in relation to petty Corfu, is scandal to the faith of entire Christendom in the case of the Pontificate. On the other hand, to regard the matter from the side of the Romans, it is equally immaterial, if the peace of the Roman Catholic Church, as we believe on the whole it does, require the independence which it could enjoy completely nowhere so well as in its old home of the Vatican, whether or no the Roman States would be happier, spite of all the risks and burdens to which the Italian kingdom may be liable, in identifying themselves with it, than in preserving their individuality through the medium of a municipal constitution. If the question had to be answered, we should not, perhaps, be quite easy in asserting that the position of any member of the British Cabinet, other than its chief, is inferior to the indisputable pre-eminence of even a Mayor in *his* Cabinet. But no such question has to be answered: it may be argued that a people like the Roman people has a right to something of self-government, and yet be consistently contended that such right does not imply any title whatever to demand union with some particular country. None would assert such title in cases where the union of two states would compromise the balance of power; and danger to the religious peace of Europe and the balance of religious power is as valid and powerful a reason for refusing consent. At all events, even though it should be contended that a European state had a right to demand the consent of Europe to its incorporation with another European state, it could not be contended that it would have a right to require the latter to consent to such incorporation, or the rest of Europe to refrain from using its influence, in the interests of its own religious peace, to prevent such consent being granted.

There are persons who have thought yet another course possible, and that, one very different to the exchange of the pontifical for the municipal *régime* as here recommended. The Papacy might, according to their hypothesis, yield to the force of circumstances with grace, and bidding farewell to the Cæsars palaces and martyrs' tombs, drift away into the wide Catholic world, quitting once and for ever at the same time its temporal Italian sovereignty, and its special Italian primacy. Refusing to be the metropolitan of the Peninsula, since no longer left free to be a prince among princes, it might cease to be Italian and become purely Catholic. From some Malta, or Corsica, nay, from some Baltimore or Quebec, or, if we wished to give the rein to our imagination, we might conceive from the Mosque of Oma

and the heights of Zion, it might issue its bulls and decrees untainted by any suspicion of Philo-Austicism or Philo-Gallicism. What a fair ideal we might imagine realized then; a council of all the most spiritual minds in Christendom, unbiassed by national prejudices, because as much at home in one nation as another; a power all pervading, and, from its very ubiquity, unassailable anywhere! The one only peril would be that its spiritual powers would be too vast and vague to be consistent with the proper operation of the conterminous secular powers. Such a hypothesis of an ecclesiastical sovereignty, the locale of which should be the centre of the religious instincts of every nation, of a dominion incapable of rousing the jealousy of any temporal power, because having no object to gratify which could come in the way of any pet secular ambition, has often found favour with persons comprehending sufficiently acutely the actual vices of the Papacy, yet also eager to preserve the benefits of ecclesiastical unity. It is a fair conception, provided this ecclesiastical power thus pictured as endowed with right and ability to give the tone to the religious feeling of Christendom, without ever presenting a vulnerable side to the secular powers which might desire to control it, should have the force to remain pure, incorrupt, and without *arrière pensée*. Nor, even supposing this spirit, thus supposed to have been appointed to sway the indurcent of the religious life of Christendom, to become lark and treacherous, jealous of its own privileges, a foe to the rights of other persons, would the conception, though not fair and beautiful, miss a certain solemnity and mystery which would still be almost fascinating. But in fact such a conception in any aspect is utterly incapable of realization. In the first place, a supreme independent ecclesiastical influence, not identified with the specific national character, would soon strive to create for itself in any nation a new set of feelings and objects in which it might develop itself and expatiate as in its own peculiar province and home. Its pretensions would be too lofty for it to be satisfied with the position which we may suppose a diplomatist to enjoy at Paris or S. Petersburg: it would arrogate the controlling influence, and right to insulate itself and its belongings, which appertains to an ambassador from Christian Europe at Constantinople. If too active in its attempts, secular governments would band together throughout Europe to worry and hunt it out of existence, as they did in the Middle Ages the Templars, and, in the last century, the Jesuits; while if indolent, whether from choice or from the force of circumstances, it would gradually, having no special sphere for the exertion of its energies, sleep away its vitality and reality, and dwindle and perish from mere inaction. In the second place, the very nature

and origin of the Papacy and its surroundings make it impossible to realize such a conception as the Head of the Roman Catholic Church denationalizing himself and his court altogether. The traditions and history, the tastes and tendencies of the Roman Catholic Church, are all Italian : its forms and ceremonies, its riches and power are all connected with, and referable to, its original position as the national Church of Italy, as well as of united Christendom.

Italy itself, though so loud in reprobating the Papacy as it is at present, would be as unwilling to let it take up its permanent abode in a foreign land as the Papacy would be reluctant to leave the soil it loves so well. Indeed, the schemes and requisitions of Italy in respect to the Papacy are exorbitant, unreasonable, and almost self-contradictory. It is incessantly inveighing, even to the verge of calumny, against the Church, and those schemes of ecclesiastical ambition which stretch far beyond the Peninsula ; but it betrays no inclination to give up the prestige and glory which, whether or no attended by more than compensating evils, the location there of that gigantic and mysterious institution brings upon the name of Italy. But Italians ought to understand that, if the Church of Rome is reduced to become merely the national Church of Italy, Catholic Europe will no longer recognise in Italy the centre of its ecclesiastical system. Nothing, however, is more clear than at present such is not the belief of Italian patriots. When they talk of Rome for the natural capital of Italy, they mean men to understand that it is the Rome of the Gracchi and the Cæsars that is before their imagination. They will not see how alien to the facts is such a picture, nor will they be persuaded to trace back the Rome of their consciousness to the acts and policy, the energy and enthusiasm, of Hildebrand and Julius the Second, of Paul the Third, and Sixtus the Fifth. Of these recollections and glories the patriots of Turin and Naples are not the legitimate heirs. With such plans and plots as they foster, they have no more title to these traditions than has the American squatter to trace his lineage to Hiawatha. And if Rome, as it at present exists, is thus the creation of the Middle Ages and Papal rule, the doubt ought sometimes to rise cold and menacing from forth the boiling whirlpool of modern Italian aspirations, whether after all it is so very self-evident as they pre-suppose whence the Italian State derives its title, or whether it has any title at all, to the possession of that which it and its secular predecessors have had no hand in forming. At any rate, they must not be amazed at seeing their ideal somewhat smirched and dimmed when at last realized ; and let them be prepared to find many of those fairy images, beauteous hybrids compounded so cunningly

of traditions really the offspring of secular and ecclesiastical despotism, however fantastically clothed for the occasion in patchwork ribands borrowed from images of liberty and freedom of thought and action, dissolving beneath the touch as tantalizingly as did the Ninevite sculptures of ivory and gold.

And if the Italian patriot, if finally triumphant to the very limit of his hopes, when he comes to take stock of his gains may, perhaps, be a little sorry that he has swept his house so very clean of all that made it once so very dear; what a surprise and shock, quite independently of questions of high politics, independently even of ecclesiastical embarrassments, will the utter change in the status of Rome and of the Papacy be sure to strike to the heart of universal Europe! To the members of the Church of Rome, Rome is the sacred city, the Christian Mecca. Its legends and its traditions—some true, some false, but even the false ones with the sanctity of the faith of many centuries upon them, and all together effectuating a certain continuity among themselves—to such persons annihilate time, and make them find no discord and incongruity, but, on the contrary, an absolute identity of idea and spirit, between the creations of the genius of Michael Angelo and the legends of the Santa Scala, between the gorgeous Basilica of S. Paul and the lonely catacombs of Calixtus.

If a change do come, whether the effect of it be to exile the Bishop of Rome from the scene of his patriarchate, or to convert him into the mere primate of a brand-new united Italy, the shock to the sentiments of Roman Catholics who are not, and perhaps to many who also are, Italian patriots, cannot be but terrific. To their sentiments it would be, perhaps, almost worse to find the Pope serenely domiciled in his own city, a near neighbour and obedient subject to an Italian Court, resident, it may be, at the Quirinal, than to visit the holy places of Rome, as pilgrims once did Mount Zion, almost by stealth, with the feeling that their natural guardian was a refugee and an exile. But in either case there would, or we may perhaps say there will, be something repulsive to such in the garish light of common day which the new Italian secular spirit will convey from the huge reservoirs of Turin, and Milan, and Florence, into all those dark sanctuaries of old memories. In a less degree the English Churchman will feel bitterly the same contrast between those past days so recent, when what was and what is seemed to be the same thing, and the new era of renovation and political enlightenment with which he could have satisfied himself to his heart's content in Liverpool, London, or Paris, without facing the mosquitoes and malaria of Italy. We do not say that it will not be a good thing for the Roman citizen,

whether prince or artizan, to have springing up in his town a different school of architecture than that which has been in vogue for the last thousand years, and under whose auspices so many generations have burrowed as happily in the ruins of the metropolis of the Cæsars as any lizard does in an old wall. But it is not all so manifestly an advantageous thing to the casual visitor. A different spirit will then brood over the Campagna, at last, perhaps, no longer silent; those gloomy ugly alleys in which, at every step, some memento of the Dark Ages, when Christianity alone was light, seems to have got entangled ages ago, and to be for the first time detected and uncovered by your accidental wanderings, may come to be penetrated by thoroughfares without that idiosyncrasy which makes the present ones always lead you back to the spot from which you set off; and, finally, a score of churches may be transformed into granaries. Then, at length, too, even the Ghetto may lose its strange squalor; and it may cease to be regarded as a mark of gratitude for our own Christianity to tell the Jews, in words of Latin and Hebrew, that 'all day long God has stretched forth His hands to them, a stiffnecked and backsliding people.' All this may happen and, doubtless, will happen, and to the good of the Romans themselves. But when Rome has thus become a healthy, and neat, and unpersecuting city, alas, for travelling Englishmen!

---



ART. III.—*Recollections of William Wilberforce, Esq. M.P. for the County of York during nearly thirty years. With brief notices of some of his personal friends and contemporaries.*  
By JOHN S. HARFORD, Esq. D.C.L. F.R.S. London : Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green. 1864.

A VOLUME which, like the present, neither forms a complete biography, nor contains much of the correspondence of an eminent man, should contain a warrant for its appearance by some special and peculiar merits. Either the additional anecdotes narrated should be entirely new and pointedly striking, or the reputation of the person commemorated should stand so high, that the smallest ray of fresh information on his character and actions must be generally acceptable. Mere 'Recollections,' even of very important persons, of those who have stood high in the public opinion of their day, of those who, rarer still, have left a mark on the history of their country, are apt to display a desire rather to preserve the memory of the narrator than of the great man himself. The reminiscences of the eminent person commemorated, enveloped in a few phrases of common-place conventionalism, are too often employed only as a buoy presumed to be sufficient to keep afloat the memory of the otherwise utterly unknown man whose name is attached to the book ; who, under the flimsy disguise of respect to his friend, selfishly seeks the attainment of an unmerited reputation. From these defects this little volume is greatly free, and if the work cannot claim the right to rivet our attention by the freshness of the information imparted, most of which had been employed before, it is still well worthy of consideration, from the importance of the position that Mr. Wilberforce held in his day. The author has throughout adhered to the plan laid down in his preface. 'The illustration of Mr. Wilberforce's private qualities,' was the theme proposed. Other labourers, closely connected in relationship, closely allied in feeling, had long ago undertaken the pious duty of the biography ; but it was still open to one who must be amongst the few survivors of those who, as grown men, were, in any measure, the contemporaries of Wilberforce in his prime, to collect in a permanent form those scattered reminiscences of conversation and habits which so often throw great light upon character, and which would otherwise have been speedily lost. The autumn is fast closing in, the full harvest has long been gathered, but there were still, so

to say, in the corners of the fields, a few half-forgotten ears of that abundant crop of brilliant memories of a man eminent by station, by intellect, and by character, to reward the labours of a diligent searcher well acquainted with the ground.

‘It is hoped that the additional authentic data here presented, and collected chiefly from Mr. Wilberforce’s own lips, may add to the veneration and esteem with which his name and character are regarded. They will also give some slight idea of him as he was seen in the retirement of the country, among a select circle of friends, whom he daily delighted by his wisdom and wit, by the charm of his colloquial powers, and by the attractive influence of his religious and benevolent affections.’—*Preface*, p. vi.

There is another reason also why the appearance of this work is particularly well timed; it is well for us now, when other objects than those for which Wilberforce laboured are more prominently before the public, to be reminded of the struggle in which he contended with such disinterested heartiness, and with so thorough an honesty of purpose. It is well for us now, when the craving after place and power and material prosperity fill up so large a proportion of the time and thoughts of men, to be presented with the portrait of one who was a politician, but not a place-hunter; whose ambition was untinged with any suspicion of selfishness; who lavished his time, his abilities, and his wealth, in the endeavour to benefit those who could never make him any return. Another reason also makes such a work with its descriptions of Wilberforce’s domestic life the more welcome to us at this present time; his influence as a social reformer is probably far more actively influential in England than even the effects of any of those anti-slavery triumphs, to the success of which he contributed so largely. We would not underrate Wilberforce’s influence over the politics of his day; more than once or twice, as we shall have occasion to show further on, the part he played was of considerable importance; more than once or twice the respect due to his judgment, the deserved weight of his character swayed the tottering balance of public opinion in the direction which he favoured. The memorable instance of his first election for the county of York is a sufficient instance of this. The impetus given by his return there to the supporters of Pitt in the House of Commons, was great and lasting.

“‘Numbers of members have confessed to me,’ writes Mr. Duncombe, ‘that they owed their success in their own counties to the example set by “ours.” By it, and nearly two hundred other victories over the adherents of the coalition party, Mr. Pitt became as strong in the House of Commons, as he had been hitherto in the affections of the people. He was then able, says Mr. Wilberforce, if he had duly estimated his position, to have cast off the corrupt machinery of influence, and formed his government upon the basis of independent principle.’—*Wilberforce’s Life*, vol. i. p. 64.

The parliamentary history of England during great part of the most eventful half century, perhaps, in the annals of our country, would be incomplete without a notice of the history of the abolition of slavery, and of him to whom that cause owed more than to any other single man. But these events are now amongst the memories of the past. Other struggles, even more keenly contested than those between slave-trader and abolitionist, have succeeded to their place in the debates of parliament. Among contests for reform and for free trade, the remembrances of the earlier discussions of this century are almost obliterated; but the influence of Wilberforce still subsists among us, even where least suspected, flowing steadily on in the quiet channels of English domestic life. Who can say how many who were contemporaries, perhaps opponents, of the brilliant speaker, the active debater, were stirred up to better things by beholding the practical goodness of the man?—how many more in this generation to whom his fame is scarcely known, by the example of those who were urged on to emulate his high-minded course of life? As we read the letters of advice and of warning and of reproof contained in the appendix to the Biography, one thought more than another rises to the mind:—these religious practices thus strictly inculcated, then noticed as novelties, stigmatized as the marks of a sect, this deeper feeling of the duties of those in high station, this consideration for the feelings of others, and the qualities which now mark, we may thankfully say, the common life of countless families in England, but then rare and unusual;—is not much of this reformation owing, however unwillingly we may confess it, to the noble pattern set by Mr. Wilberforce, conjointly with the influence of those to whom his bright example was a rallying point in times of doubt and trouble?

Mr. Harford, in a few words, and with the aid of a characteristic letter, explains the way in which he first made acquaintance with Mr. Wilberforce. He was supported in the endeavour to attain this honour, as he evidently felt it to be, by powerful credentials. The good offices of Henry Thornton laid the foundation, which was strengthened by a letter of introduction from Hannah More. Perhaps there were no two persons whose good opinion would have had so much weight with Mr. Wilberforce. But Mr. Harford did not repose merely on the recommendation of others. Congeniality of pursuits cemented the friendship, and the doors of Mr. Wilberforce's house were soon opened to him, as to a familiar friend. Mr. Wilberforce, during the whole of his career, was eminently a hospitable man; nor would it have been easy to him to have lived the life of a recluse, even had he been inclined to attempt the part. Thus

we are told at an earlier period of his life than that to which we are at present referring, Mr. Wilberforce resorted to Bath for the sake of the waters, a journey frequently rendered necessary by the maladies which continually assailed his fragile constitution. Disliking the immediate society of the 'Pump-room circle,' he sought the 'right to be quiet without offence,' by purchasing a villa near the town. On this vain effort at seclusion his old friend, H. Thornton, remarked :—

'Wilberforce has bought a house near Bath, which I a little lament on the ground of the bad economy of it ; for he is a man who, were he in Norway or Siberia, would find himself infested by company : since he would even produce a population for the sake of his society, in the regions of the earth where it is the least. His heart also is so large that he never will be able to refrain from inviting people to his house. The quiet and solitude he looks to will, I conceive, be impossible, and the Bath house will be troubled with exactly the same heap of fellows as the Battersea Rise one.'—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 350.

Few are, we may add, the survivors of those who remember that hospitable neighbourhood in periods so remote from the present, but a genial warmth of feeling long haunted the spot—a habit, so to say, of kindness become indigenous to the soil. This readiness to extend his social influence was one of the marked habits of Wilberforce's character. The same point is curiously illustrated by one of the detached papers in the appendix to the Biography. In this memorandum, headed 'Friends' Paper,' the names of some eighteen or twenty families are jotted down, and the method of procedure with each carefully noted. Some are marked to be called on, some to be looked after by others, some to be asked to dinner, some to receive other attentions ; for some, books are to be provided, with others, the more difficult task is to be attempted of grafting on them suitable friends. But all are to be kept well in hand, and some kindness shown to each and all. Mr. Harford was soon brought within the influence of the benevolence which prompted all these efforts for the benefit of others, and found himself speedily placed on the most complete footing of intimacy. Mr. Wilberforce, at the time when Mr. Harford thus formed his acquaintance, was between fifty and sixty years of age, and it is in itself a proof of the geniality of his disposition, that a man so much younger than himself should obtain a place in his friendship. It may assist us to remember how long, at that date, 1812, Mr. Wilberforce had been in public life, by recalling to our memories that he had been first returned member for Hull in 1780. More vividly, perhaps, shall we appreciate how far back his connexion with the past extended, by the fact that though this volume of reminiscences was only published in the present year, one of the most characteristic sketches both of Wilberforce's appearance and his abilities, has been preserved

to us by no less classic an authority than the Biographer of Dr. Johnson. The occasion was a memorable one. We have already alluded to it above; it was immediately before Wilberforce's first election for Yorkshire. A vast assemblage of the freeholders of that, the largest county in England, then undivided in its representation, was gathered in the Castle Yard at York, to decide on the merits of the rival candidates. It was a cold day in the month of March, the hail came down in sheets. Such was the inclemency of the weather, that men of the greatest physical powers had scarcely succeeded in making themselves audible. The meeting had been a protracted one, and the listeners were weary when Wilberforce came forward.

"I saw," said Boswell, describing the scene to Dundas, "what seemed a mere shrimp mount upon the table, but as I listened, he grew and grew until the shrimp became a whale." Such was the magic of his voice and the grace of his expression, that by his very first sentence he arrested, and for above an hour he continued to enchain, the attention of the surrounding multitude. "Danby tells me," writes Pepper Arden, "that you spoke like an angel. That, indeed, I hear from many others." The disadvantage under which his figure had at first appeared, from the scale and construction of the hustings, was soon forgotten in the force and animation of his manner.—*Life*, vol. i. p. 53.

The great ability which Wilberforce then displayed, fixed his position for life. The admiration of his auditors hailed him already as member for the county, a position which had hitherto been held by the nominee of the great families of the district. Wilberforce, who desired the honour above all things, still considered success so doubtful, as to have secured his seat for Hull, though, as his journal records—

'I had formed within my own heart the project of standing for the county. To any one besides myself I was aware that it must appear so mad a scheme, that I never mentioned it to Mr. Pitt or any of my political connexions. It was undoubtedly a bold idea, but I was then very ambitious. However, entertaining it, I carefully prepared myself for the public debate, which was soon to follow in the face of the whole county; and both at the public meeting, and in the subsequent discussions, it was this idea which regulated the line, as well as animated the spirit, of my exertions. All circumstances indeed considered . . . my mercantile origin, my want of connexion or acquaintance with any of the nobility or gentry of Yorkshire . . . my being elected for that great county appears to me, upon the retrospect, so utterly improbable, that I cannot but ascribe it to a providential intimation, that the idea of my obtaining the high honour suggested itself to my imagination, and in fact fixed itself within my mind.'—*Life*, vol. i. p. 57.

This honourable position he retained for twenty-eight years, having been returned six times, and invariably without any opposition; and when he withdrew from the laborious duties involved by being a member for the largest county in England to the less onerous post of the representation of Bramber, one

of the nomination boroughs which was swept away by the Reform Bill—

'I have every reason to believe,' Mr. Wilberforce wrote at the time to a friend, 'that I never should have experienced another opposition. But I began to perceive traces of infirmity, which, from considerations alike of duty and prudence, determined me to retire from my dignified station, and to accept the friendly offer of a seat in parliament which would absolve me from the obligation of constant attendance. Several of my Yorkshire friends were for the first time dissatisfied with me; and the letters which I received from various quarters were such as could not but be gratifying to any liberal mind. And here I cannot forbear mentioning a trifling anecdote, which is not without importance in the proof it affords that the general course of a public man may be approved by many who may not concur with him in his political opinions. On my way to the House of Commons, one day soon after my having exchanged my seat for Yorkshire for the borough of Bramber, I met Mr. Sheridan. After we had exchanged salutations, "Do you know," said he, "that I was near writing to you some little time ago?" On my asking the occasion of his intended letter, "Why," said he, "I read in the newspaper your farewell address to the freeholders of Yorkshire, and though you and I have not much agreed in our votes in the House of Commons, yet I thought the independent part you acted would render your retirement from parliament a public loss. I was about therefore to write to you, to enforce on you the propriety of reconsidering your determination to retire, as I supposed, from public life, when I was informed that you were to come into parliament for Bramber; this information made me lay aside my intention."—*Life*, vol. iv. p. 69.

Wilberforce in his early parliamentary career was an ardent supporter of the policy pursued by Pitt, and, consequently, an opponent of the ministry then headed by Lord North. His abilities soon caused him to take a prominent station. Of his early correspondence with Pitt, a few specimens are preserved showing the easy footing of familiarity to which he was admitted by that generally reserved and shy man.

'Their acquaintance grew into close intimacy. Pitt lived much in what may be termed a select club of his personal friends, young men of great talent, most of whom looked to him as their political leader. They were about twenty-five in number, and met at the house of a man named Goostree, in Pall-Mall. Among them were Pratt (afterwards Lord Camden), Althorp (afterwards Lord Spencer), Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville), Robinson (afterwards Lord Rokeby), Smith (afterwards Lord Carrington), Lords Duncannon, Euston, &c. Mr. Pitt, Mr. Bankes, Mr. Wilberforce, &c. &c. Mr. Pitt had the reputation in after life of being remarkably distant and reserved in manner, and he was apt to be so amongst strangers. "I remember," said Wilberforce, "being present at a dinner when Mr. Ryder, afterwards Lord Harrowby, was one of the guests, and was first introduced to Pitt, with whom he subsequently became officially connected and lived in terms of friendship. Pitt was very silent throughout the afternoon, and I knew that Ryder's presence was the real cause of it; but when amongst his friends he was one of the most agreeable of men, full of wit, playfulness, and vivacity. Bankes and I were already in possession of our fortunes; therefore his house in town, and my villa at Wimbledon, were the scenes of our frequent meetings.

"Pitt's delight was to sleep in the country, and therefore," said Mr. Wilberforce, "he and I, when the House did not sit very late, were in the habit of



driving to Wimbledon together; and on one occasion he lived thus with me for months. Often and often have I called him in the morning, and the capacities of the villa were frequently put to the utmost stretch to accommodate our various friends.'—*Harford's Recollections*, pp. 144-5.

Together with him and Mr. Eliot, Pitt's brother-in-law, Wilberforce made a short tour to France in the year 1783. Two of the notes written by Pitt on the occasion have been preserved. They are full of the sort of remarks naturally to be expected at such a time from a person who anticipated vast pleasure from the short ramble proposed, and are interesting as proofs of how cordially he valued Wilberforce's society. The object of the journey was to obtain fluency in the French language. The narrative of this little foreign tour, besides being curious as marking one of the very few occasions on which that hard-working statesman Pitt ever appears, according to his 'Life,' as indulging in such a thing as a six weeks' holiday from his duties, is interesting as showing the friendly footing on which he and Wilberforce stood towards each other. It is interesting to us besides from the curious picture of French manners and habits which it presents. The France of that period was as unlike the France of twenty—of even ten—years afterwards as if the country had been situated in another planet. Rheims, where they fixed themselves for a time, was governed by the Archbishop, who still maintained considerable state. The only letter of introduction the three friends possessed was to a M. Coustier, to whom, with some fear and trepidation, they transmitted their credentials.

'The next day he called. He was a smart-looking man, with a bag wig and sword, and his manners were easy and polite. After conversing with them for some time, and offering his best services, he took his leave. They quickly returned his call, and expected from the appearance of their new acquaintance to have found him living in one of the best mansions of the town; but to their no small surprise and amusement they found themselves at the door of a little grocer's shop, where behind the counter stood their friend with his apron on, doling out pennyworths to his customers. Not at all abashed, in an instant he doffed his apron, showed them into an inner parlour, and talked away with French ease and vivacity. He frankly told them, on their inquiring whether he had any acquaintances amongst the gentry of the city, that he had none; but, he said, he would go to the Commandant, and apprise him of their arrival. He did so, and the intelligence was soon after communicated to the Archbishop, who, on hearing that three Englishmen, members of Parliament, and one of them calling himself Mr. Pitt, were in Rheims, was incredulous as to the fact. However, he sent a Monsieur de Lageard (who had been in England to give evidence on the Douglas cause) to call and report the result. This gentleman quickly found that all was right, and was so pleased with his new friends that he spent some hours in their company. After this the Archbishop paid them great attention, as did also the principal families of the place. The story of their *début* at Rheims soon got wind, and it so amused Marie Antoinette, that after they were introduced at Court she seldom failed, on seeing Mr. Pitt at her parties, to inquire whether he had heard from his friend the *épicier*.'

Another droll anecdote connected with their stay at Rheims was as follows:—

'Supping one evening at the house of one of the gentry, they observed a large space left vacant in the middle of the table, which was in other parts covered with delicacies. The party was large, and a mysterious smile and whisper circulated amongst the guests. Presently the door of the apartment flew open, and two servants entered, bearing between them a huge dish of roast beef, which was put down with an air of importance in the vacant place. The beef was cut, and the Englishmen invited to fall to. It proved to be almost raw, and they could none of them touch it. As to Mr. Pitt, he never ate any meat which was not thoroughly well done. The French appeared much disappointed, and it was clear they thought their guests were ashamed to display their national tastes before strangers.

'From Rheims they proceeded to Paris, and thence to Fontainebleau, where the Court then was. Here they received great attention. Marie Antoinette shone amidst the brilliant assemblage—that star of grace and beauty described by Mr. Burke with such chivalrous feeling. Though Mr. Pitt was shy of talking French, he expressed himself when he did converse with great correctness, and left behind him some impression of his wonderful powers.'—*Harford's Recollections*, pp. 147-9.

Some slight variations occur between the account given of this visit in Mr. Harford's book, and in the 'Life,' which may be easily accounted for by the time which had elapsed, and the effect of it on Mr. Wilberforce's memory. In the description given there, the friends appear at first to have imagined that the redoubtable M. Coustier was playing at selling groceries, as M. Jourdain's son endeavoured to make out that his father had kept a shop. 'Lui, marchand? C'est pure médisance; il ne l'a jamais été. 'Tout ce qu'il faisait, c'est qu'il était fort obligeant, fort officieux; 'et comme il se connaissait fort bien en étoffes, il en allait 'choisir de tous les côtés, les faisait apporter chez lui, et en 'donnait à ses amis pour de l'argent.' They were, however, soon undeceived on this head. The remembrance of their visit to Rheims lasted long. The Archbishop, 'who gave us two very 'good and pleasant dinners, and would have had us stay a week 'with him (N.B. Archbishops in England are not like *Archévêques* 'in France; these last are jolly fellows, of about forty years of age, 'who play at billiards, &c. like other people,)' two and thirty years after, in 1815, was able to look back on these merry meetings with a friendly warmth. At the later date he became the channel of communication between Wilberforce and the King of France (Louis XVIII.), conveying, with many assurances of goodwill, the desire of the former with regard to the Slave Trade. We find him then expressing the

'King's intention of making himself completely master of a subject with which he was already in some measure acquainted, "par les différentes motions que vous avez faites au parlement sur cette grande question et les discussions auxquelles elles ont donné lieu." "Pour moi," added the

Archbishop, "j'y ai trouvé, Monsieur, les sentimens de bonté et d'humanité, que j'avois reconnus en vous lorsque j'ai eu le plaisir de vous recevoir chez moi, et je vous y temoigner, ainsi qu'au célèbre ministre votre ami, que je retiens toujours tous les sentimens d'estime que j'avois pour l'un et l'autre."—*Life*, vol. iv. p. 223.

Many entries in Wilberforce's diary show how close the connexion between Pitt and himself was. Early in date among them is that curious one, which describes with such simple genuine satisfaction the glorious achievement of having persuaded Pitt and Pepper Arden to Church. The same feeling is shown to have endured to the last, by the statement in Mr. Harford's 'Recollections' that, to his latest day, Wilberforce seldom mentioned Mr. Pitt's name without some affectionate epithet. The same feeling is evidenced among those outpourings of tribulation which record the wrestlings of spirit which convulsed his career, when that mighty change in his inner man came on him which marked the rest of his life. Many of Wilberforce's friends appear to have dropped from him then, unable to imagine an adequate motive for his conduct, or unable to imagine that his society would be desirable after the flame had thus passed on him. Mr. Pitt, almost alone, with characteristic greatness of soul, appears to have been able to accept at once the genuineness of the call. His conduct was full of kindness and good feeling, and no political difference afterwards could destroy the tie, though at times endangering it.

'I wrote to Mr. Pitt,' said Wilberforce, 'frankly communicating to him the great change that had taken place in my views, and the effects which this change would probably produce upon my public conduct. I told him that, "although I should ever feel the greatest regard and affection for him, and had every reason to believe that I should in general be able to support his measures, I could no longer act as a party man." Pitt's reply was most kind. He assured me that nothing which I had communicated to him could ever alter our friendship, and that he hoped I would always act as I thought right. I had said to him that, perhaps, it would be as well that we should not, when we met, enter into any discussion upon the topics of my letter. To this he replied, "Why should we not discuss them?" He thought I was in low spirits, and proposed to come and spend the next day with me at Wimbledon. He came, and we had a great deal of conversation. He was at that time inclined to be sceptical. The fact is, he was so absorbed by politics that he had not allowed himself time for due reflection on religious subjects. At first he tried to reason me out of my convictions; but he found himself unable to question their justness, or the propriety of my resolutions, on the supposition that Christianity is true.'—*Harford's Recollections*, p. 210.

We are often assisted in forming a judgment of the characters of persons, by observing how their demeanour appears to others on whose discrimination we can rely, and we may gauge in some degree the depth of Wilberforce's qualities of mind, by noticing the esteem in which he was held by Pitt. 'They were,' says one who often witnessed their familiar intercourse, 'exactly like

brothers.' Among the public events which most deeply pained the Minister, was Wilberforce's first open opposition in the House of Commons. The rest of that imperturbable spirit which was unmoved through so many dangers, which stood unconcerned in the midst of so many difficulties, was broken by the opposition of his friend. Two events only, we are told, in the public life of Mr. Pitt, were able to disturb his sleep, and of these one was the opposition of Wilberforce. The friendship between the two men was a solace to both; Pitt found in Wilberforce a useful parliamentary ally on most occasions. Wilberforce, on his side, was greatly indebted to a friend so high in office for assistance in promoting the great objects to which he devoted his life. When, in 1787, he resolved to bring the subjects of the abolition of slavery and the condition of the African before the notice of Parliament, it was after serious and friendly deliberation with Pitt. Mr. Harford's 'Recollections' on this point are amongst the most interesting in his volume. It is a pleasant picture,—the two statesmen and their friend sitting in cheerful talk 'in the 'open air, at the root of an old tree at Holwood, just above the 'steep descent into the Vale of Keston,' holding

'debate, a band  
Of youthful friends on mind and art  
And labour and the changing mart,  
And all the framework of the land.'

'I one day asked Mr. Wilberforce what had first induced him to take up the slave-trade question. He told me that Granville Sharp's philanthropic efforts on behalf of a runaway slave in 1780, &c. and a pamphlet of Clarkson's, had first turned his attention seriously to the subject, and that in the same year he had set on foot inquiries through Mr. Gordon, a large West India proprietor, respecting the condition of the slaves in those colonies. "Mr. Gordon was himself going out thither to inspect them, and I expressed my hope to him," said Mr. Wilberforce, "that the time would come when I should be able to do something in behalf of the slaves." It was not, however, till the year 1787 that Mr. Wilberforce seriously resolved to take up the question. He had then acquired much information upon it, having often been amongst the African merchants, who had communicated to him many important particulars respecting the details of the traffic. "In 1787," said he, "I was staying with Pitt at Holwood—one has often a local recollection of particular incidents—and I distinctly remember the very knoll upon which I was sitting, near Pitt and Grenville, when the former said to me, "Wilberforce, why don't you give notice of a motion on the subject of the slave-trade? You have already taken great pains to collect evidence, and are therefore fully entitled to the credit which doing so will ensure you. Do not lose time, or the ground may be occupied by another!" I did so, and upon that occasion Fox said he had himself seriously entertained the idea of bringing the subject before Parliament; but he was pleased to add, that it having got into so much better hands he should not interfere. In 1788 I was in such indifferent health as to feel it my duty to entreat Pitt, in case it pleased God I should not recover, to promise to take up and prosecute this important object for me. He assured me that he would. In 1789 I opened the question to the House, and the line of argument which I pursued was this: I explained the nature of the traffic for slaves on

the African coast—the flagrant evils, the wars, the cruelties, the barbarisms which it engendered—the obstacles which it opposed to the progress of civilization—and also strongly dwelt on the horrors of the Middle Passage. Finally I insisted on the impolicy of the trade, since by improving the condition and treatment of the slave population in our islands, their numbers might be kept up by natural means. Sir William Dolbyn, and some other members to whom the subject was new at this time, hearing that a slave ship fitted out for the traffic was then lying in the river, went on board to examine the arrangements, and to test the correctness of some of my statements. They returned from the survey penetrated with indignation and horror, and added much to the impression which my speech had produced by what they reported. Yet there were persons who attempted to deny these horrors altogether, and spoke of the Middle Passage as a voyage of pleasure! Liverpool, it was asserted, would be ruined by the abolition. See how Liverpool has advanced in prosperity. The trade, it was argued, was essential as a nursery for our seamen. Clarkson proved to a demonstration the contrary.”—*Harford's Recollections*, pp.138—140.

The records of the debates of that period are extremely imperfect. A bare outline remains to us of a speech which appears to have been full of power and brilliant with eloquence. The cogency of the arguments employed, and the force of the humane sway exercised over the listeners is best shown by the influence exercised over their sympathies. That ‘audience of orators,’ as it has been happily termed, was not slow in admitting the power of the kindred spirit who addressed them. Rarely was it possible for Pitt and Fox to agree in upholding the same cause, yet Pitt and Fox rose in succession, warm in their praises and their support. And the eloquence and genius of the speech drew warm praises even from the critical judgment of Burke, in whose ‘opinion not merely the British nation, but all Europe were under very great and serious obligation to the honourable gentleman for having brought the subject forward in a manner the most masterly, impressive, and eloquent. Principles so admirably laid down, with so much order and force, were equal to anything he had ever heard of in modern oratory, and perhaps it was not excelled by anything to be met with in Demosthenes.’ Thus was Wilberforce fitly launched on the enterprise which occupied the maturity of his powers. Through shade and sunshine, through difficulties and opposition, through good report and evil report, he steadily continued his exertions till he found that—

‘Not once or twice in our fair island-story,  
The path of duty was the way to glory :  
He, that ever following her commands,  
On with toil of heart and knees and hands,  
Thro’ the long gorge to the far light has won  
His path upward, and prevail’d,  
Shall find the toppling crags of Duty scaled  
Are close upon the shining table-lands  
To which our God Himself is moon and sun.’

So many years have passed since these events were taking place, that their importance has somewhat fallen into the shade; especially at the present time, when, from impulses generous in intention, recent events have, to a certain extent, drawn public opinion into another channel, and the admiration justly due to that heroism with which the seceding States of the great American republic have held their own in so awful a combat, has even gilded with a sort of factitious brilliancy, the cause of the slaveholder. But while acknowledging, as justice also compels us to do, that some of the bright hopes and fervent aspirations of the friends of the African have failed to receive their accomplishment as yet, no failure, however complete, no disappointment, however great, can make us swerve from the firm belief that justice to the race of slaves has already brought, and will eventually bring even more, solid advantage to the race of masters. No change of system in a government—scarcely any change even in the taxation imposed by any government—can be made without some sufferers having great, and frequently just cause for complaint. And we must not wonder if the emancipation of the slaves—a far more important measure to isolated communities dependent on that system for support, than any change in taxation—brought with it distress to many, and ruin even to some. But the assertion then made by the solemn act of emancipation has been the source of many benefits to the inhabitants of Great Britain, and even to millions more—to all who live beneath the sway of Great Britain's Queen. The assertion that justice was recognised as paramount, and that in no trivial matter—in a matter engaging vast interests, in a matter involving questions of imperial policy—has assisted, in no small degree, we feel convinced, in the development and extension of our colonial power. The pages on which the dealings of civilized nations with their uncivilized fellow-men are written, form a record to which no one can turn without feelings of sorrow and shame—of sorrow at injustice and cruelty; of shame that our boasted civilization is, under such circumstances, of so little avail in restraining the passions and brutality of man. But we owe it, we believe, to the abolition of slavery throughout the British dominions, that the Englishman has not been as the Spaniard, and that our Colonial Empire is founded, as we believe it to be founded, on enduring principles. The necessity for individual exertion felt by those who have held no subject-race in bondage, has greatly tended to promote the spirit of self-reliance which, more than any other quality, renders the emigrants from our shores the fit pioneers of progress. Slaveholding, we may consider, in a word, to



have the same effect in social matters as protection in commercial matters; the tendency of such a policy is to enervate the energies, and to stifle the very progress which it pretends to promote. To the complete victory of the cause of abolition there has followed, as frequently follows on such victories, a degree of forgetfulness of the merits of the cause—of the efforts of those who laboured for that cause so well. Several of the descendants of the giants who were in those days have, however, as occasion served, shown their readiness in these later times to buckle on their armour at the call of duty. Among whom, although it is almost invidious to particularize, we may mention one, the near kinsman of the late Sir T. F. Buxton, and the son himself of a less-known labourer in the cause—less known only because his meek spirit sought no earthly honours, but distinguished by his death in the service of his fellow-men—Mr. W. E. Forster, whose powerful speech in the House of Commons two sessions since, reminded—successfully reminded—a lukewarm and listless audience of the side to which their allegiance was most justly due.

Mere lapse of time has done much—mere lapse of time always must do much—to dim the glories of the past, and the memories of the most heroic struggles. As we stand beneath the shadow of the dome of S. Paul's Cathedral, and survey the monuments of the departed great ones whose ashes are beneath our feet—whose fame, their epitaphs tell us, will be immortal—whose loss, as we read in the inscriptions, the nation continues to deplore—do we feel all these words as keenly, or a tenth part as keenly, as those did who saw the coffin of the great naval hero slowly lowered into the grave—who felt as if, by his untimely loss, the right arm of the country were suddenly shattered—who, burdened with their grief, saw his humble shipmates, gallant as himself, impressed with a kindred feeling, divide on the spot, as their dearest remembrance, the tattered flag under which he had led them to victory—under which his body had been just borne to its last resting-place? More—much more—than a mere lapse of time has taken place between now and then. It has not been a mere efflux of years—it is not a mere dull waste of stagnant existence which separates us from the commencement of the century. Between that time and this, how many great events have taken place! the period has been the most stirring in the whole history of England. All this, and, as we said before, the course of recent events on the continent of America—political bitternesses, party rancour, personal ridicule, and continued misrepresentation—have been employed to render the cause of the slave-trade abolitionists unpopular, and to endeavour to hide the truth.

It is now scarcely possible to imagine with what fury the storm raged. It would be easy to extract from Mr. Wilberforce's own life ample corroboration of this statement. But to the general charges of failure, a speech of Lord Macaulay's in 1824 supplies the answer in so eloquent a form, that we cannot forbear quoting from it. Objectors had raised the cavil, For what good purpose is all this labour undertaken? Do you expect that these degraded and brutalized slaves will ever rise in the scale—we had almost said, even to the level of human intelligence? Is not all your sympathy, are not all your efforts utterly thrown away on these herds of mere animals? Lord Macaulay had been answering objections like these, and expressing warmly his hopes, his anticipations of the contrary—

'I cannot think these anticipations chimerical when I reflect on the past condition of our own country, and on the interesting and pathetic event to which, in a great measure, it owes its present blessings. In an Italian slave-market, a priest observed some children of exquisite beauty exposed for sale. He asked whence they came; he was told from England. His heart burned within him; he pitied the misery and degradation of a distant people. As soon as he was raised to the Papal throne, he instantly took measures for introducing into this island the Christian religion, and all the moral and political blessings by which that religion has ever been accompanied. We are not exactly informed of the difficulties which he had to encounter, but we know that in every age human nature is the same; that in every age it is through hatred and obloquy that the path lies to virtue and to glory. There were, probably, grave statesmen to suggest that the work of amelioration had better be left to the Wittenagemotes of the Heptarchy. No doubt there were slaveholders who protested that their slaves fared more sumptuously than the King of the Lombards. The statue of Pasquin was not then standing in Rome; but then, doubtless, there were not wanting wits to deride his enthusiasm, and liars to asperse his character. It is not impossible that there may have been found ruffians to pull down his chapels, and forsworn judges to send his missionaries to the gallows. However this may have been, we know that he persevered; and now, look at the result! Now look at the miserable, the degraded country, the land of the oppressor and the oppressed! There is freedom in the respiration of its air, and in the very contact of its soil! Now look at that ocean which then bore to our coast nothing but plunderers, and carried back from it nothing but cargoes of misery and despair. That very ocean now rolls around us at once to enrich and to defend—at once renders our coast everywhere accessible to commerce, and everywhere impervious to war. Look at our maritime power, at our commercial opulence, at our martial glory, at the proud list of our great men; and then reflect from what we were raised, and by what means.'—*Macaulay's Speech on the Abolition of Slavery*, June 25, 1824.

We must now conclude our brief and imperfect sketch of the position filled by Wilberforce on the abolition question. It was impossible, it would have been entirely impracticable, to have attempted the slightest notice of the great champion of the cause, without speaking of his efforts to assist the slave. But any one who, from the great prominence which emancipation assumes in Wilberforce's memoirs, imagined that the whole of

his parliamentary attention was fixed on it alone, would commit a very great, though perhaps a natural mistake. Kindred subjects were by no means neglected. Thus during a debate in July, 1813, on the best means of promoting the religious and moral improvement of the people of India, Mr. Wilberforce pressed strongly the desirability of countenancing the efforts of missionaries. But that he was not a mere fanatic, eagerly desirous of imposing his own religion on the conquered race, pursuing with blind fury a deep-laid scheme for proselytising, prepared to persecute should arguments fail to convince—the following statesmanlike remarks on our Indian dominions will show :—

‘On the most superficial view, what a sight does that empire exhibit to us ! A little island obtaining and keeping possession of immense regions, and of a population of sixty millions that inhabit them, at the distance of half the globe from it ! Of inhabitants differing from us as widely as human differences can go—differences exterior and interior—differences physical, moral, social, and domestic ; in points of religion, morals, institutions, language, manners, customs, climate, colour : in short, in almost every possible particular that human experience can suggest, or human imagination devise ! Such, sir, is the partnership which we have formed : such, rather, the body with which we are incorporated—nay, almost assimilated and identified. Our Oriental Empire, indeed, is now a vast edifice ; but the lofty and spacious fabric rests on the surface of the earth without foundations. The trunk of the tree is of prodigious dimensions, and there is an exterior of gigantic strength. It has spread its branches widely around it, and there is an increasing abundance of foliage and of fruit ; but the mighty mass rests on the ground merely by its superincumbent weight, instead of having shot its roots into the soil, and incorporated itself with the parent earth beneath it. Who does not know that the first great storm might possibly lay such a giant prostrate ? If, sir, we would render ourselves really secure against all such attacks, let us endeavour to strike our roots into the soil, by the gradual introduction and establishment of our own principles and opinions—of our own laws, institutions, and manners—above all, as the source of every other improvement, of our religion, and, consequently, of our morals. Why, sir, if it were only that we should thereby render the subjects of our Asiatic Empire a distinct and peculiar people—that we should create a sort of moral and political basis in the vast expanse of the Asiatic regions, and amidst the unnumbered myriads of its population—we should render our East Indian dominions, by this change, more secure, merely from the natural desire which men have to preserve their own institutions, solely because they are their own, from invaders who would destroy them. But, far more than this, are we so little aware of the vast superiority even of European laws and institutions—and far more of British laws and institutions—over those of Asia, as not to be prepared to predict with confidence that the Indian community, which should have exchanged its dark and bloody superstitions for the genial influence of Christian light and truth, would have experienced such an increase of civil order and security, of social pleasures and domestic comforts, as to be desirous of preserving the blessings it should have acquired ; and can we doubt that it would be bound by the ties of gratitude to those who had been the honoured instruments of communicating them ?’—*Recollections*, pp. 38–41.

Was this the language of a mere visionary, or of a man capable of deep thought and statesmanlike prescience ? We may cite one instance more from Mr. Wilberforce’s parliamentary

career, which may give us some idea of the respect in which he was held in the House. In the session of 1805, as will be well remembered by any one conversant with the parliamentary history of that time, the celebrated Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry was brought under discussion, and with it the charge of misapplication of the public money against Lord Melville. Pitt, then prime minister, was most anxious to secure the acquittal, or failing that, a verdict at least of 'not proven,' in favour of his political colleague and personal friend, and exerted himself to the uttermost in his cause. The debate on the conduct of Lord Melville was vigorous and protracted; during its progress many friends of the minister strove to withstand the fury of his assailants.

'Still, however,' we quote the history of the event from Lord Stanhope's brilliant *Life of Pitt*, 'the independent members looked grave, and shook their heads. They had been accustomed by Pitt himself to the most scrupulous precision and purity on all points of public money; they did not like Lord Melville's case so far as they could understand it; and for their guidance they looked mainly to the decision of Mr. Wilberforce, whose conscientious and impartial turn of mind commanded their just respect. It was, therefore, amidst no common thrill of expectation that late at night Mr. Wilberforce rose. He had waited until almost the last to hear and to weigh all the arguments adduced in support of a Committee. He sat at the extremity of the Treasury Bench, and he related long afterwards, that when he rose and turned towards the chair, he looked just across Mr. Pitt, and observed him listen with intense earnestness to catch the first intimation of the course which he would take. "It required no little effort," added Wilberforce, "to resist the fascination of that penetrating eye—from which Lord Erskine was always thought to shrink." But he did not leave the House long in doubt. In his very first sentence he declared that he must vote for the original motion. He was strongly impressed, he said, with the culpable conduct of Lord Melville, and could not refuse to satisfy the moral sense of England. Such a speech from such a man was decisive of the question. It rallied to itself nearly all the independent members, as, for example, Sir Robert Peel. At four in the morning the House, in breathless silence, proceeded to divide, when the numbers were found to be exactly equal:

For the Motion	-	-	216
Against it	-	-	216.

Not for many years, I think, on a question of anything like the same importance, had it been found requisite to appeal in this manner to the Speaker's casting vote. Thus appealed to, the Speaker, in great anxiety of mind and after some minutes of doubt and deliberation, gave his vote in favour of Mr. Whitbread's motion. Thus the first of his resolutions was declared to be carried.—Lord Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. iv. pp. 281-2.

This narrative, describing the culminating point of one of the most painful crises in the life of Pitt, of one of the very few occasions on which his mastery over the Lower House failed him, is the more valuable to us, as it is taken from an independent source. Lord Stanhope, a few pages before the extract which we have just given from his book, has recorded

his own belief that Wilberforce was mistaken in the opinion which he supported. Whether the charges brought against Lord Melville were true or not, is foreign to the object of our present inquiry ; but nothing can be clearer than the respect in which Wilberforce was held by the House,—nothing can show more decisively the place he held, than the fact that on so momentous a question his opinion should have been so anxiously looked for, and should have possessed such weight with so many. Nor was the question one in the slightest degree connected with any of Mr. Wilberforce's philanthropic pursuits. It was a question of matter of fact, of the personal conduct of a member of the Government, on which a clear, honourable, straightforward judgment was the thing desired. Had the opinion held by many about Mr. Wilberforce been correct, had he been that mere religious fanatic some have made him out to be, would his good-will have been so much courted by the Minister? Would his lead have been followed, as it was at this time, by the independent members whom Lord Stanhope so graphically describes?

Mr. Wilberforce did not retire from Parliament till 1825, after more than forty years' service in the difficult part of an independent member. We have attempted in the pages immediately preceding to sketch out, however faintly, some of the most noticeable points in this long and honoured career. In doing this we have frequently been compelled to quote from the five volumes of the Biography; and indeed it was indispensable to do so. Mr. Harford's book would be scarcely intelligible to the reader who does not possess some previous acquaintance with the leading points in Wilberforce's life. The volume before us, as we mentioned at the outset, does not give us either a complete biography, or even contain within itself the unshaped materials of such a work. To render the thread of the narrative in any measure complete, it was needful to have recourse to other sources. By doing this we are persuaded that we best do justice both to our subject and to Mr. Harford. The value of his book consists in the hints it affords us of Wilberforce's character, which, like detached gems, form a mere heap of sparkle when removed from their setting. The social position of Mr. Wilberforce, and the influence which he exercised over his contemporaries, both of which receive additional illustration from Mr. Harford's little volume, are all as full of instruction as any part of his parliamentary career. We will now pass on to the consideration of these points.

Mr. Harford's reminiscences confirm the impression that one of the most powerful causes of Mr. Wilberforce's influence was the great sincerity of his character—sincerity in the fullest sense

of the word, joined with that genial kindness which enters so largely into the composition of the noblest natures :—

‘I never,’ says Mr. Harford, ‘beheld in any person a more positive rejection, I might say, spurning of anything like flattery, or a more unaffected renunciation even of that sincere homage which was often proffered by those who approached him for the first time. The sacred influence which had descended upon him from above early in life, when God called him by His grace, accompanied him through every stage of his earthly existence. As a little instance of his consideration for the feelings of others,—I had been folding up several letters in covers for him ready to be franked. On handing one of them to him in a cover which had served the same purpose before (for he often used covers in good condition a second time) observing it to be ticketed with the name of an individual in humble circumstances, he said to me, “Pray be good enough to envelop this letter in a clean half sheet. If it was to any one of the higher class it would do perfectly well; but this poor man may perhaps construe it into an intended slight.”’

‘It has been observed that the possession of power is one of the severest tests of the human character. Men who have appeared in private life amiable and unassuming have often, when placed by the course of events in circumstances of high influence and station, become arrogant and presuming; and even good men, in such circumstances, frequently hurt the feelings of their friends by somewhat of the bustle of self-importance or the abruptness of decision. Not seldom have I been struck, in the course of my long acquaintance with him, with his utter superiority to all such littleness. Whether I saw him in the privacy of his own house, or in the lobby of the House of Commons—whether he was getting into his carriage for an ordinary drive, or on such an occasion as a visit to the Emperor Alexander—he invariably appeared in the same Christian frame of mind, intent upon the day’s business; but lending a ready ear to any present appeal of humanity, or to any claim of friendship—animated by affectionate, kind, and cordial feelings, and desirous to lose no opportunity of receiving or of doing good. I have already spoken of his constant self-recollection, even amidst the busiest and most exciting scenes. Hence arose a no less constant self-command. Frequently have I seen him placed by forgetfulness or inattention in his servant’s in circumstances peculiarly harassing, at the very moment that he was pressed upon by important business, or by the urgent claim of an immediate appointment; and yet I do not ever recollect to have witnessed anything of unkindness or petulance in his manner of addressing or reproving them. Yet he has told me that he was ‘naturally irritable to a degree which was very trying to his nearest relations. One of the very first victories which he achieved over himself, he added, after he became a religious man, was the entire correction of this bad habit. He became, and he continued through life, a model of the very opposite qualification.’—*Recollections*, pp. 260—2.

With all this there was a genuine simplicity of character, which took constant pleasure both in the ordinary transactions of life, and in ‘little things,’ and not far from the surface at any time was a fund of drollery was ever ready for enjoyment. In earlier days an admirable mimic, he had been restrained from pursuing this pastime, at once so fascinating to the imagination, and, we must add, so likely to prove lowering to the character, by the wise severity of Lord Camden :—

‘Lord Camden,’ Wilberforce remarked to one who stored the remark in his memory, ‘noticed me particularly, and treated me with great kindness.



Amongst other things, he cured me of the dangerous art of mimicry. When invited by my friend to witness my powers of imitation, he at once refused, saying slightly for me to hear it, "It is but a vulgar accomplishment." "Yes, but it is not imitating the mere manner; Wilberforce says the very thing Lord North would say." "Oh," was his reply, "every one does that."—*Life of Wilberforce*, vol. i. p. 30.

His daily habits were marked by a genial cheerfulness—

'After morning prayers he often paced the terrace of the house, or strolled into the flower garden, and whoever was his companion was sure to see him full of delight at the various beauties or wonders of nature. Sometimes he was attracted by its grander features, at others, by the scent or the pencilling of a flower. Of flowers he was peculiarly fond. He delighted to gaze upon their colours, and to investigate their structure; and most of his favourite pocket authors were thickly set with them in a dried state. It was often hard to persuade him to quit the garden for the breakfast table, and when he made his appearance, it was generally with a flower in his hand. Once there, he was sure to be the life of the party. It was a meal in which he took particular pleasure. He was then also peculiarly ready for conversation and discussion, and we frequently forgot time when thus engaged. He used to say it was one of the distinctions between us and animals, that the latter sat munching their food by themselves, but that men have the faculty of exercising their mental powers while they satisfy the requirements of nature.

'He was fond of receiving visitors at his own house at breakfast, or of meeting them at the houses of his friends. From the breakfast table he retired to his dressing room, and was actively engaged with his secretary in answering letters, or in listening to reading. Letters of importance, or to his more particular friends, he wrote, when his eyes permitted, with his own hand, but others were chiefly dictated to his secretary. About two or three o'clock in the day he generally came down stairs, and was ready for a drive or a walk; but a long walk was his particular delight. He possessed as a companion, as we have already said, an unceasing fund of delightful conversation. A life spent, as his had been, amongst many of the greatest men of his time—himself one of the most distinguished—and possessed of social qualities of the highest order, how could the conversation of such a man be otherwise than deeply interesting? Then there was such simplicity and purity of heart—such touches of tenderness and of exalted piety—that every previous sentiment of affection and veneration towards him was deepened by being admitted to his familiar intercourse. He liked an early dinner, and throughout the whole course of it his mind was actively at work. At his own house I have often been amused to observe him carrying on a discussion while in the act of carving a large joint; often addressed by others, and often interlacing his subject with exclamations at the bluntness of the knife, or paying little attentions to his guests, and then taking up the broken thread of his subject and pursuing it amidst the same sort of interruptions. For the last eight or ten years of his life he was in the habit of retiring soon after the ladies left the room to take a siesta; but he reappeared at the tea-table, when his entry enlivened every countenance. He was fond of sitting up late with a friend, either for reading or talking. The habits of the House of Commons had made late hours so familiar to him that he often appeared reluctant to retire."—*Recollections*, pp. 257—260.

The man, whose old age is thus described, passed his early youth amongst the most brilliant, the gayest society of his time. Wilberforce was indeed a man whose society was likely to be courted. Besides great versatile ability, ready wit, and brilliant

conversation, he possessed, says his biographer, a large fortune and most accessible manners. His exquisite voice and rare accomplishment in singing must not be forgotten:—

“Wilberforce, we must have you again, the Prince says he will come at any time to hear you sing,” was the flattery which he received after his first meeting with the Prince of Wales, in 1782, at the luxurious soirées of Devonshire House.

That a man who had lived in this manner should change his whole mode of life while still in the vigour of early youth,—turn his back on the society which had been most congenial to him, strike out a new path for himself, and steadily persevere in that course, eschewing for the future any habits which he considered inconsistent with the duties of Christianity,—must have startled and surprised all his former associates. No ascetic fleeing for his soul's salvation from the most luxurious life in Egypt, to the strictest seclusion in the desert, could ever have obeyed the call to take up his cross, more completely than was done by this member of the British Parliament. And the marvel was greater still. The English Christian, unlike his earlier prototype, did not become a mere anchorite, did not seclude himself in any sequestered hermitage, but endeavoured to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, in the full glare of a busy life, in his place in the House of Commons, in crowded drawing rooms in London. As if the difficulties of the step were not sufficient in themselves, Mr. Wilberforce added to them by announcing the change to many of his friends,—some of whom derided, some thought the impression likely to be temporary. His intimate associates having been thus warned, a more general announcement followed in the publication of ‘*The Practical View of Christianity*.’ This treatise on the duties of a Christian man, though undoubtedly strict in the precepts inculcated, is marked throughout by a breadth of tone which distinguishes it in a very favourable manner from many manuals of the like nature. Mr. Harford took advantage of his intimacy with the author to discuss the book:—

‘Early in our acquaintance Mr. Wilberforce presented me with a copy of his admirable work entitled, “*A Practical View of Christianity, &c.*,” and on various occasions I conversed with him upon it, and on the motives which had induced him to write and publish it. Amongst these he laid great stress on the fact that—living as he necessarily did much in the world, and among men of ability and rank in Parliament, for many of whom he felt sincere regard, and whom, nevertheless, he had reason to consider as in a state of much neglect and unconcern with respect to the “one thing needful”—he could not but feel an earnest desire frankly to express to them this conviction, and to place before them a clear statement of what he conceived was the essence and the object of true religion. Occasions suited to such a statement scarcely ever occurred, and were, in fact, rendered impossible by the courtesies of life and the forms of society. He felt, therefore, anxious to relieve his conscience on

this point, and he did so by the publication of this work, which brought before its readers in a clear manner his own views on the important subject in question.' *Recollections*, p. 103.

To attempt to give any outline of the 'Practical View,' would lead us far away from the points to which we have desired to draw our readers' attention. We may be permitted, however, to make one quotation from it, from the chapter which speaks of the advantage to a community of the growth of a deep religious feeling among its members :—

'True Christian benevolence is always occupied in producing happiness to the utmost of its power, and according to the extent of its sphere, be it larger or more limited : it contracts itself to the measure of the smallest ; it can expand itself to the amplitude of the largest. It resembles majestic rivers, which are poured from an unfailing and abundant source. Silent and peaceful in their course, they begin with dispensing beauty and comfort to every cottage by which they pass. In their further progress they fertilize provinces and enrich kingdoms. At length they pour themselves into the ocean ; where, changing their names, but not their nature, they visit distant nations and other hemispheres, and spread throughout the world the expansive tide of their munificence.'

Had any one desired to describe the aim of the benevolent spirit, the practice of the God-fearing life, of the author of this brilliant passage, he could scarcely have done so with greater felicity of expression. Many are the mighty names written in the annals of our country,—many are the mighty dead entombed in the Abbey at Westminster ;—some have been more renowned, some have attained more distinction ; but amongst them all, few can claim a higher place for integrity of purpose, devotion to a great cause, and true nobility of character, than William Wilberforce.

---

ART IV.—1. *Memoirs, Miscellanies, and Letters of Lucy Aikin.*

Edited by PHILIP HEMERY LE BRETON. Longmans.

2. *Cities of the Past.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Trübner.

3. *Italics.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Trübner.

WE doubt if society in our own time admits of such a picture of a mind and a life as the above memoir presents—if it be possible in our day for any one to be so satisfied with his share of the intellectual good things of the world, so lastingly content with the circle in which he finds himself, so at one with his surroundings, so serenely certain through long years that he and the people about him hold the clue to all the truth not yet attained, as the subject of this memoir shows herself to have been. From her cradle to her grave, as far as we are admitted into her mind, Lucy Aikin felt herself one of the aristocracy of intellect, living in the very centre of light and illumination, and not unworthy of so high a calling. It was no sudden inflation, and, as such, subject to depression, but an abiding conviction, that what the world held of wise discerning and truth-loving she knew, lived, and worked in. The state of parties, the tumult of opinion, the love of change, the divided headships—every one with a creed or doctrine of his own—prevents this serenity of content in every case; but more especially the changes wrought by time alter the position of women, of those women, we mean, who aim at occupying the van of progress. Formerly, clever women of the strong-minded school coalesced with men; now they have separate interests and aspirations, and are for ever issuing disturbing theories which break up the old compact system of warfare against prescription.

Lucy Aikin may be considered a precursor of the present school of *esprits forts* among women. We can easily trace the course by which her opinions have grown, by a natural development, into those of the other lady whose name appears in our heading; but they are consequences she would in many instances have disclaimed, and we must say that we greatly prefer the flower to the fruit. There is a solidity, a sense of responsibility about the earlier manifestation of this spirit, which we miss in the later; and moreover there is a dignity in mere consistency. Most lives strike us with such a sense of failure; they are led with so little design, and are so merely the sport of accident and circumstances, that the picture of a decorous, grave, consistent existence, which pursues a course, holds by its opening

of thought and opinion, and retains all the esteem and credit it has ever received to the end, necessarily wins respect, though our sympathies are not otherwise engaged. Miss Aikin was a disciple all her life, a favourable specimen of a certain class of opinions in action, never an originator. The liberal Unitarian element found in her an excellent exponent; the principles of her party exactly hit her natural turn of mind and temper; but we have no reason to suppose that if she had been born into another school of thought she would have forsaken it for the one she so consistently represented. There is a docility even in her professions of independence, and her attraction towards new lights, which shows her always a scholar. She was so usually guided by reason, so emphatically a sensible woman, that she might have sat, indeed very likely did sit, as the model for some of Miss Edgeworth's superior women; and when this idea is conveyed there is little more to be said of her outer course of life. Sensible women do not make adventures for themselves, and circumstances did not provide them for Miss Aikin, as far at least as the slight memoir tells us; hers was a life of talking, and thinking, and writing, not of doing, or even of suffering, beyond what is inseparable from a life of more than eighty years. Her affections were bestowed on her family and friends, nor is there any hint that they were ever centred on a single object. As shown to us, she represents single life in its most self-sustained, satisfied, dignified aspect. Her sphere was society, and this and natural domestic ties were to all appearance fully sufficient for her happiness—a feeling more deserving the name, according to her own estimate, and more sensibly realized by her than most can pretend to. No biography can be more meagre of detail. If we are to know anything of a woman in any way distinguished, we naturally—more in her case than a man's—expect some personal characteristics as guides to our judgment; but we are here left almost in the dark on all points of looks, voice, and manner, and all that makes up the woman's full complement of influence in social life. Perhaps nothing very marked in these respects is to be looked for in a character of which sense in action is the prevailing idea, and, without any hint of externals, we have a clear enough impression given us of a woman, wise according to her light, cheerful, and contented; finding this world a very pleasant place to live in, with no disturbing aspirations which this world cannot satisfy, and no difficulties or spiritual perplexities; cultivating her reason, and apparently never encountering anything too hard for that reason to settle to her satisfaction; always spending her time in what she believed the most useful manner; always talking what she aimed at being something worth hearing; always seek-

ing the society of people whom she could respect even to the point of holding them the depositaries of truth, physical and moral.

There is something really generous in the strong impression she shows of living in an age of stirring events, great things, great men, great discoveries, as of a new age opening upon the world in which she would willingly take some share of work to be done; and if her accomplished efforts and partial attempts in this direction fall far short of the point she aims at, or believes herself to have attained, this need not prove her utterly mistaken in her own powers. We see clearly that she had weight in her own circle—in its way a distinguished one; and the fact that she was the recognised channel through which Channing learnt what was going on in England, and as it seems conveyed his thoughts and speculations back again, shows the high estimation in which she was held, which her own carefully composed letters in a degree justify. This correspondence probably brought her more formal literary labours to an end. In the pleasure of imparting her own view of parties and events to a man joining in his own person the prestige of a political and religious leader, whom she revered in the latter capacity as only a woman can do, she satisfied the writing impulse; and a subject of any sort—whether chosen out of history or from the wide field of morals—would be to any woman possessed by a strong admiration for a man of genius flat and unexciting compared with the work of chronicling passing events, with a view to influence and direct his opinion on current questions. In this sense it is an unusual form of correspondence, a piece of contemporary history so far as she could write it. She had to put him *au courant* of all that occupied her world, which in her estimation represented the thought of the day. Her opinions on many points are prejudiced and narrow-minded in the highest degree, but not more so than the school in which she lived, and whose views on all public general questions she echoed—though where her womanly instincts had free play, she could think both clearly and candidly for herself. The one prejudice or rather antipathy that never moderates is her feeling towards the English Church, its bishops and clergy; and it is very clear that no expression of opinion on these points could be overcharged for her correspondent's taste, not when she pronounces ninety-nine out of every hundred English clergymen hypocrites. To such people what is called the Oxford movement was so altogether beyond their comprehension that contempt was the only resource. But in fact the school of which she was an hereditary member had not reached then the stage of universal sympathy and lofty insight into every mind which constitutes the impertinence of modern scepticism, and makes its



disciples the insufferable patrons of every form of belief as the right thing for the people weak enough to hold it. Of this party Miss Cobbe is the present female representative.

It will be known to most of our readers that Lucy Aikin, (born Nov. 1781,) was daughter of Dr. Aikin, a man of high literary and scientific reputation in his day, and one of the first promoters and editor of the *Athenæum*, a paper which still represents the opinions of the same school in their more advanced stage. The Aikin family were remarkable for unity of thought on this head. Mrs. Barbauld, Dr. Aikin's sister, so well known to our childhood for her prose hymns, and for her 'Evenings at Home,' set herself to the task of liberalizing, and, in some points, really enlarging the infant mind. The 'Evenings at Home,' by the way, written in conjunction with her brother, we cannot help suspecting to be confused by some modern critics with Miss Edgeworth's 'Parent's Assistant,' when they speak of the many charming stories contained in these volumes which delighted their childhood. There was no storyteller's impulse in the Aikin mind, which is uniformly didactic, and aims at inculcating views by the true direct method of precept illustrated by formal example. The brothers were both prominent men in the scientific department of the same school, and we will add the strong family affection which held these brothers and their sister through life in such close unity of affection and interests, is a very pleasant trait of family character. It is one of the effects of the aristocratic element to bind men and families to a certain unity and consistency. The members of our great families stick by one another, and, as a rule (to which, however, there may be an increasing number of exceptions), to the principles which they receive as an inheritance along with name, title, and more substantial possessions. It is probably the same with aristocracy of intellect, or what is felt and assumed to be such. There are families that hold themselves to possess a prescriptive genius and talent, and whose credit therefore depends in a degree on conforming to the family type. Some such influence as this is very conspicuous in the mind before us. She never had any misgivings in any part of her life that she and the stock from which she sprung were not of the aristocracy of intellect, and she lived in days when, in a certain sense, power of this sort was much more regarded and respected than it is now.

Miss Aikin's grandfather, the Rev. John Aikin, D.D. had been classical and divinity tutor at the Presbyterian Academy of Warrington, a place which then boasted of a more cultivated and refined society than any other provincial town. There she was born, but, when only three years old, her father removed to

Yarmouth, where he practised as a physician for some years. The grandmother, it is recorded, was so used to precocity in her own children, that she pronounced little Lucy a dunce for not reading fluently at three, an insult very keenly remembered, if not resented, by the authoress that was to be. That she was really sharp enough her father showed by a story of her deciding an historical question when she was but six. We give it to show what were within a sharp child's interests before the modern deluge of exclusively children's books. Some one talking of Cadmus, and whether he lived before or after the Trojan war, she decided the matter by observing that she had heard her brother read in Pope's Homer about a son of Cadmus fighting against the Trojans.

There are a few pages of autobiography, where we read:—

'On reaching Yarmouth, Dr. Aikin at once entered on the active discharge of his profession. His daughter thus describes her early experience of her new residence. "The arrival of a new physician, already a writer of some distinction, of polished and unaffected manners, and endowed with powers and with tact which rendered his conversation attractive and acceptable to all, was an event of no small importance in the town of Yarmouth. His speedy popularity was reflected upon all the members of his family, and upon none more strongly than on the little rosy, laughing, chattering girl of three years old. I was soon in danger of being totally spoiled with flattery; nothing indeed could have saved me but the good sense, the firmness, the parental affection well understood of my excellent mother. She taught me what flattery was, and strongly warned me against being led away by it.

'The lesson was doubly painful; it showed me that those who knew me best were aware that I was far from deserving the praises lavished upon me by strangers, and it gave me the impression that these most agreeable strangers were guilty of the horrible offence of telling fibs. I bore the shock pretty well, however, and was the better for the warning. Still my little heart *would* beat with triumph when the Rev. Dr. Cooper<sup>1</sup> withstood, I know not how long, the impatient summonses of three grown ladies to the quadrille table with the answer, "I had rather talk with this child." To confess the whole truth, I have still a kind of tenderness for the first man that ever flattered me.'—Pp. xiii. xiv.

Miss Aikin, we gather from the whole volume, was uniformly commended for the accuracy and finish of her own style, whether in speaking or writing. It was clearly a point on which she felt herself strong, and sets down even Dr. Channing with the air of one who, on this point, was unassailable and high authority. On the whole, such a reputation acts as a salutary check against extravagance of opinion. Deliberation in the choice and ordering of words is very likely to induce deliberation in thought, and a great deal of the good sense of Miss Aikin's views, where we find it, may owe something to her care in the choice of words, and desire to express herself with clearness and precision. As for any particular felicity or grace of style,

<sup>1</sup> The Rector of Yarmouth, father of the eminent surgeon Sir Astley Cooper, Bart.

these were neither to be expected from the nature of her mind nor views. This vigilant attention by her parents to the selection and the pronouncement of her words might, on the other hand, conduce to her ignorance of the condition and manners of the poor and lower classes which attended her through life. We can hardly at present understand the jealous watchfulness which the ultra-liberal school of that day showed against the intercourse of children with their inferiors, more especially with servants, or the haughty assumption of moral as well as social superiority which was thus inculcated upon young chits, who were expected in their maturity to assist in the equalizing of the world, and the demolition of mere rank distinctions. Knowing nothing of the poor herself, she subsequently showed a great jealousy of the move in another direction, which the revival of church principles gave rise to, and there are arguments later on in the book of the harm to purity and refinement of manner that intercourse with the poor might do to the young ladies who throw themselves into such work, though not without some consciousness of her own shortcomings. Of the influences upon her own childhood she thus writes:—

‘One memorable day, my brother George, several years older, seized and devoured half of a tart destined for the supper of us two little ones. Fired at the injury, I ran with the fragment into the presence of papa and mamma, and denounced the offender in most emphatic terms. “You should be willing to give your brother part of your tart,” said my mother. “But he did not ask us,” I replied—“he took it;” and I still think that the distinction was just, and that his action ought to have brought him, and not me, the reprimand. But how many fold was I compensated when my father, who had listened with great attention to my harangue, exclaimed, “Why Lucy, you are quite eloquent!” O! never-to-be-forgotten praise! Had I been a boy, it might have made me an orator; as it was, it incited me to exert to the utmost, by tongue and by pen, all the power of words I possessed or could ever acquire—I had learned where my strength lay.’—P. xvii.

And afterwards on the great effect of natural scenes upon her:—

‘This interest was inexpressibly exalted by Mrs. Barbauld’s prose hymns, which were taught me, I know not how soon. Her “Early Lessons” had prepared the way, for in them too there dwells the spirit of poetry; but the hymns gave me the idea of something bright and glorious, hung on high above my present reach, but not above my aspirations. They gave me first the sentiment of sublimity, and of the Author of all that is sublime. They taught me piety.’—P. xviii.

From Yarmouth, Dr. Aikin moved to London in 1792, where he practised till ill health obliged him to retire from his profession. Then he removed to Stoke Newington, and devoted the remainder of his life to literature, and also to the cultivation of his daughter’s mind, who was a wonder of acquirement in that day when young ladies had not yet caught the knack, in which they are at present so happy, of learning something of

everything. It was thought a great thing in Miss Aikin that she read the Latin classics with facility, and was familiar with the best French and Italian authors; and she herself comments on the all but universal ignorance of German in her own youth; their early friend William Taylor, the translator of 'Lenora,' being, she believed, the first Englishman of letters who had read Goethe, Wieland, Lessing, and Bürger in the original. It was a sort of matter of course that she should enter in due time upon literary composition. She was an authoress from her seventeenth year, translating, writing articles in the magazines and the *Annual Register*, making attempts at verse, after the manner of Pope, and finally settling upon history as the vein for which she was best adapted. She brought out in 1819 her 'Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth,' of which it is perhaps no disgrace to profess an ignorance, though the work was very well received at the time. This was followed by the reigns of James I. and Charles I.; the last of which it is worth while to glance through, for the simple picture of prejudice it presents, and the curious 'feminilities' through which this prejudice sometimes transpires. It was a family affair with her, as not only had her family principles to be respected, but her ancestors were Presbyterians; and with a king so strict for his prerogative as Charles, and a bench of bishops with Laud at their head as representatives of tyranny and priestcraft, candour appears to her a virtue scarcely called for. Her first step, in the very first page, is to undermine our idea of the king's personal beauty by falling foul of his legs; every act of his that does not square with our modern administrative system is black treachery and oppression; she quotes avowed libels against him as history, on the ground that there *must* be truth in them, or they would not have been written, and hurries and slurs over the pathetic account of his last days and the last scene of all, as though it burnt her fingers. How important and prominent she felt herself as a writer of history, and how perilous, even, she esteemed the boldness of her line of thought, we may gather from what she on one occasion says to Dr. Channing (1838):—

'In the meantime, it seems to me we are going on well; reforms proceeding slow and sure, and decidedly the tone of at least a large portion of society becoming constantly more liberal, both in religion and politics—the natural effect of the continuance of a whig and low-church administration. I perceive signs also of a revival of literature, which now again is able to hold up its head in the presence of science, by which it was for some time in apparent danger of being totally overshadowed. In particular it pleases me to perceive that historical literature is cultivated with great activity, for which there are two obvious causes: a state of public feeling which allows history to be written freely without incurring persecution either from the government or the mob; and, with respect to our own country, a great accession of new information from the printing of the public records.

"These favouring circumstances, I think, will enable even me to conquer my long desponding indolence, and attempt a new design. My plan is not yet matured, but it is only *entre nous* that I give any hint of it; but I am turning my thoughts towards something like a view of letters and social life in England during the first sixty years of the last century, *i.e.* the reigns of Anne and the two first Georges."—Pp. 375, 376.

Either, however, she felt the state of things, in some respects so friendly, was leaving her behind, or the correspondence of Dr. Channing condensed all her thoughts into one channel. But conversation was probably her real *forte*: and for this a friendly reviewer of her works in the *Athenæum* estimates she spent no inconsiderable time in preparing herself beforehand; as her talk itself showed. This might not be from mere love of display, but that she liked to do things well; and no doubt, whenever talk is an art, some time and thought must be devoted in preparation for it. We do not profess to know how the preparation is done, but something of the sort there must have been when people talked so much more formally well than they do now.

"One who knew her well," has truly said of her—"that she possessed in a remarkable degree the art of conversation, an art which seems in some danger of being lost in the crowds which fashion brings together. It was not, however, an art cultivated for display. Whether in intercourse with a single friend in a small circle, or an assemblage of persons of intellectual attainments equal to her own, there was some flow of anecdote, quotation and allusion, furnished by a most retentive memory, and enlivened by wit and humour."—P. xxvii.

She lived in a circle of good talkers, and was in the way of meeting the greatest literary celebrities of the day. So many people who cannot do without society are yet uncandid enough to do nothing but abuse it, that it is pleasant to read her avowed satisfaction with her friends, and her allusions to the close circle of friends and neighbours who 'tempted her with delicious idleness—if that social intercourse may be called idleness in 'which neither head nor heart are unoccupied.' It has been argued that nobody really feels that he himself is in the centre of things; that he, in the full understanding of the word, is the world; that he enjoys free companionship with the choicest development of intellect. But Miss Aikin had the feeling. She felt that all the people worth knowing she knew, not by occasional chance, and tolerated contact, but as a courted privileged member, a sort of centre who could bring eminent men together, secure introduction for her friends, pass judgments, admit and reject. 'I want' (she writes to Dr. Channing) 'I want you to know multitudes of English people. How much we could do towards placing you in a small select circle, where you would be appreciated,' &c. &c. Hence society was, with her, the field, the subject for the exercise of

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. John Kenrick, of York.

her independent mind. When her thoughts expatiate most naturally it is on social questions; her heart was in society, the world, in its least frivolous sense. Her set were mainly of one way of thinking, and she could not do justice to any one who was not a liberal in religion and politics; but also she was never intimately acquainted with minds of any other order. When she has to describe or define what good talk really is, and to give her own experience, there is a finish and accuracy of discrimination which prove that in this case she is drawing from her observation, and not, as elsewhere, from her prejudices. Take the following peep at Cambridge society, written in 1827, to her friend Mr. Holland:—

‘I am a very little addicted to journeys myself; but lately an irresistible temptation was thrown in my way, and I indulged myself in the pleasantest thing possible—a jaunt to Cambridge, which I had never seen, planned by Mr. Whishaw and Professor Smyth, and in which our very agreeable neighbours, Mr. and Mrs. Mallet (he is a son of Mallet du Pan, and secretary to the Audit Board, and she a charming woman) partook. Mr. Whishaw took her and me down in his carriage, and a very amiable young Romilly on the box; Mr. Mallett went down by coach. We left on the Thursday and returned on the Sunday. The professor gave us two grand dinners, and assembled several of the brightest stars of the university to meet us; among the rest the Bishop of Lincoln, certainly one of the most admirable persons I have ever seen—mild, polished, perfectly unassuming; but firm and consistent in liberal views and principles, and acute and full of talent. We had also Mr. Sedgwick, the Woodwardian Professor, and the great mathematician Whewell. These two are intimate friends, and a good deal alike in their cast of mind and manners; that is to say, they are very clever and able men of that kind of which Mr. Brougham is the great exemplar—men of wonderful energy and activity of mind, profound in one or two branches of knowledge, and ignorant of none, whose conversation teems with allusions drawn from the most various and distant sources, illustrating bright and original ideas of their own—men to whom it is a delight, but not a relaxation, to listen—whose thoughts flow almost too rapidly for language to overtake them—whose ideas come crowding and jostling like a throng in a narrow gate. In Mr. Brougham, the experience of the world and the habit of applying his eloquence to practical points in law and politics, on which it is his business to talk down to very ordinary capacities, has moderated the exuberance which reigns unchecked in the discourse of these academics; but if any force of circumstance could have tied him down to a college life, he would have been such as one of these. It pleased me to observe how completely in these instances the spirit of the nineteenth century has mastered the spirit of monkery and the middle ages in which our universities were founded; but the forms are still kept up, more than the forms in some things.’—Pp. xxv. xxvi.

Elsewhere she again adduces Lord Brougham as her ideal of a converser:—

‘Brougham is our new Lord Chancellor—the Edinburgh reviewer—the radical-whig—the apostle of universal education and popular literature, whom we are astonished and delighted to behold in that highest dignity of a subject! This is the man, the only man, whose powers I contemplate with wonder. In society he has the artless gaiety of a good-humoured child. Never leading the conversation, never canvassing for audience (in truth he has no need), he catches



the ball as it flies with a careless and unrivalled skill. His little narratives are inimitable, the touch-and-go of his remarks leaves a trail of light behind it. On the tritest subjects he is new without paradox and without effort, simply, as it seems, because nature has interdicted him from commonplace. With that tremendous power of sarcasm which he has so often put forth in public, he is the sweetest-tempered man in private life, the kindest in its relations, the most attracting to his friends—in short, as amiable as he is great.—P. 216.

On many occasions Dr. Channing sends his countrymen to her, and she reports their success in English society. Thus:—

‘Your friend Mr. Goodhue spent an hour with me one morning, and I was much pleased with his mild and amiable manners, and the information which he gave me respecting many of your institutions and societies. I wished for more of his company, and invited him for the next evening, when I expected Mrs. Joanna Baillie, Professor Smyth, and another valued friend, Mr. Whishaw, a gentleman who has written little, but whose literary opinions are heard in the most enlightened circles with a deference approaching that formerly paid to Dr. Johnson. Mr. Goodhue was unfortunately engaged, but he sent me Mr. Richmond, and the result was, one of the most animated and amusing *conversazioni*, chiefly between him and the two gentlemen I have named—for we ladies were well content to be listeners—at which it has ever been my good fortune to be present.

‘A more fluent talker than Mr. Richmond I think I never heard, and I doubted at first how he might suit my two old gentlemen—both of them great eulogists of good listeners—but he is very clever, and there was something so *piquant* in his remarks on what he had seen here, such a simplicity in his questions, and when he spoke of his country, such abundant knowledge, so ably and clearly expressed, that they were content for once take such a share of talk as they could get by hard struggling. I think the professor of modern history got matter for a new lecture on American law and politics; and he and Mr. Richmond took pains to contrive another meeting. But to me the most curious part was Mr. Richmond’s wonder at having got into such high company as two or three baronets, a Scotch countess, and some lord; and his difficulty to imagine, and ours to explain to him, how our difference of ranks *works* in society. He evidently supposed a much wider separation of classes than actually takes place. I believe the structure of society with us may best be expressed by what an eminent naturalist has said of organised nature—it is not a chain of being, it more resembles a net, each mesh holds to several others on different sides. Our complicated state of society, in recompense of great evils, has at least this advantage, that it brings the rich man or noble into relation with a multitude of individuals, with whom he finds it necessary to his objects to associate on terms of social equality, notwithstanding great disparity of birth or fortune.’—Pp. 210, 211.

Lord Denman she regarded as a sort of family achievement, her aunt having given the bent to his tastes, a fact which may throw some light on the part he took as a lawyer and judge in Church questions:—

‘You know, of course, by reputation, our new Lord Chief Justice, Denman—the zealous defender of poor Queen Caroline, who in his excitation called our last king Nero, and our present one “a base calumniator.” He wants caution, and is not the deepest of our lawyers; but his promotion is hailed by all congenial spirits as a triumphant example of the highest professional dignities attained by a man who never showed any other fear than that of being thought capable of sacrificing the most minute portion of truth, the nicest punctilio of

honour, to any worldly interest. Glorious days in which such conduct finds acceptance! On his taking leave of Lincoln's Inn in consequence of his promotion, a speech was made to him by his old friend the Vice-Chancellor, complimenting him on the love of liberty he had ever manifested in a strain which drew tears down the furrowed cheeks of the old benchers—practised worldlings as they must be. This glorious man—by the way, his person is made for dignity—was Mrs. Barbauld's pupil at four years old. I think it must have been chiefly for him that her "Hymns in Prose" were written; and he cherishes her memory most religiously. In a great public entertainment where I met him last year, he came up to me and said with a look of delight, "I dreamed of Mrs. Barbauld only last night!" He has a love and a taste for poetry and elegant literature worthy of her scholar, and I doubt not that she sowed the seed."—P. 274.

She gives her experience, in a letter to her brother, of Sir Walter Scott, whom she met in a London literary party, where he probably did not feel or seem quite in his element:—

'Have I got thus far in my letter and said nothing of last Friday! It is a great proof of my methodical and chronological habits of writing that I did not jump to this *period of my history* in the first paragraph. Know, that on Thursday last arrived an invitation from the Carrs to my father and my aunt to dine with them the next day, to meet Walter Scott—apologies at the same time that their table would not admit us all. Well! nothing could persuade my father to go, so my aunt said she would take me instead, and I had not the grace to say no. A charming day we had. I did not indeed see much of the great lion, for we were fourteen at dinner, of whom about half were constantly talking, and neither at table nor after was I very near him; but he was delighted to see my aunt, and paid her great attention, which I was very glad of. He told her that the "Tramp, tramp," "Splash, splash," of Taylor's "Lenora" which she had carried into Scotland to Dugald Stewart many years ago, was what made him a poet. I heard him tell a story or two with a dry kind of humour, for which he is distinguished; and though he speaks very broad Scotch, is a heavy-looking man, and has little the air of a gentleman, I was much pleased with him—he is lively, spirited, and quite above all affectation. He had with him his daughter, a girl of fifteen, the most naïve child of nature I ever saw; her little Scotch phrases charmed us all, and her Scotch songs still more. Her father is a happy minstrel to have such a lassie to sing old ballads to him, which she often does by the hour together, for he is not satisfied with a verse or two, but chooses to have *fit* the first, second, and third. He made her sing us a ditty about a border reiver who was to be hanged for stealing the bishop's mare, and who dies with the injunction to his comrades,

"If e'er ye find the bishop's cloak,  
Ye'll mak it shorter by the hood."

She also sung us a lullaby in Gaelic—very striking novelties both, in a polished London party. Nobody could help calling this charming girl pretty, though all allowed her features were not good, and we thought her not unlike her father's own sweet Ellen. I had the good fortune to be placed at dinner between Mr. Whishaw and Sotheby, better known by Wieland's Oberon than by his own Saul. He is a lively, pleasant, elderly man; his manners of the old school of gallantry, which we women must ever like. A lady next him asked if he did not think we could see by Mr. Scott's countenance, if Waverley were mentioned, whether he was not the author? "I don't know," said Mr. S—, "we will try." So he called out from the bottom of the table to the top, "Mr. Scott, I have heard there is a new novel coming out by the author of Waverley, have you heard of it?" "I have," said the minstrel, "and I believe it." He answered very steadily, and everybody cried out directly, "O, I am glad of it!" "Yes," said

Mr. Whishaw, "I am a great admirer of those novels;" and we began to discuss which was the best of the two, but Scott kept out of this debate, and had not the assurance to say any handsome things of the works, though *he* is not the author—O no! for he denies them.—Pp. 99, 100.

But Scott was never appreciated in strictly literary circles. His amiable manner won people up to a certain point, but his writings were a standing thorn in the side of the liberals. Her subsequent strictures on Lockhart's 'Life' show the feeling of her set, while his early training goes diametrically against the notions of education inculcated by the moralists of her party.

'If you look into Lockhart's "Life and Correspondence of Scott," of which one volume has appeared, and as many more will appear as the public will submit to pay for, you will find an amusing fragment of an autobiography, comprising enough of the early years of this extraordinary man to show distinctly the circumstances by which the turn was given to his tastes, sentiments, and pursuits. Much of his sickly childhood was passed at a farm-house, where his chief companions were cattle, and the peasants who tended them. His predominant inclination being to hear stories in order to tell them, he soon made himself master of all the epics of that border country, and hence his heroes are always of the moss-trooping order, and his machinery consists of brownies, kelpies, and fairies. Hence, too, his unquenchable animosity against the *Southrons*. Observe how seldom he draws an Englishman but as a coward or a fool. His vivid fancy, his animal spirits, his good humour, and habitual kindliness, and his perfect freedom from affectation, must be liked, and might be envied; but the furniture of his mind was really made up of trumpery. Elevation of sentiment he had certainly none, and philosophy was far from him as the antipodes. Mr. Whishaw said once, of Bentham, that he was a schoolman born some ages too late: Scott was a stark moss-trooper in the same predicament, and a jacobite.'—Pp. 360, 361.

She had a large acquaintance with the literary ladies of the day, indeed there is scarcely a name that might be expected which does not occur, with some intelligent notice. Joanna Baillie was her intimate friend, who seems to have slid out of Presbyterianism into Unitarianism, as so many did at one time, and who gave it as the reason why there were so few Unitarians out of the Scotch church, that there were so many in it. In a short memoir of this lady she gives a remarkable example of the stoicism of this school before it was indoctrinated with transcendentalism:—

'Repression of all emotions, even the gentlest, and those most honourable to human nature, seems to have been indeed the constant lesson of her Presbyterian home. Her sister once told me that their father was an excellent parent: when she had once been bitten by a dog thought to be mad, he had sucked the wound, at the hazard, as was supposed, of his own life—but that he had never given her a kiss. Joanna spoke to me once of her yearning to be caressed when a child. She would sometimes venture, she said, to clasp her little arms about her mother's knees, who would seem to chide her—"but I know she liked it." Be that as it may, the first thing which drew upon Joanna the admiring notice of Hampstead society, was the devoted assiduity of her attention to her mother, then blind as well as aged, whom she attended day and night. But this task

of duty came at length to its natural termination, and the secret of her authorship having been permitted to transpire, she was no longer privileged to sit in the shade, shuffling off upon others her own fair share in the expenses of conversation.'—P. 8.

For Miss Martineau her feelings experience a considerable change. She is at first greatly taken with her cleverness, and repeats with pride Lord Brougham's saying, 'There is a deaf girl at Norwich doing more good than any man in the country.' Soon after she writes (1833):—

'Here I paused to welcome Harriet Martineau, with all her blushing honours thick upon her. The Chancellor had sent for her expressly to write tales illustrative of pauperism, and has supplied her for the purpose with an immense mass of documents accessible only to official persons. I believe she will do much good; her motives and principles are pure and high, and success, as I predicted, has improved, not spoiled her. Indeed, she has very extraordinary talent and merit, and a noble independence of mind.'—P. 276.

But as the lady's principles develop Miss Aikin is obliged to moderate her tone, and to make reservations and disclaimers which separate her on certain points from the more advanced liberals of her sex. Thus, she writes to Dr. Channing (1837):—

'Well might you be sorry at the tidings that I sympathised in Miss M.'s ideas of the sphere of women; but if she is in the habit of advancing her opinions on no stronger foundations than she has for this, small must be the proportion of truth in them. The facts are these. I saw her a few days after her book came out, when I had only looked in it for half an hour, and was even ignorant that she had said anything on the subjects of marriage and divorce, on which I hold her doctrine to be as ignorant, presumptuous, and pernicious as possible. . . .

'In a very merry little female circle, at the time I mentioned, and I have never seen her since, we hailed Harriet as our champion, between joke and earnest, and she then told us of the scheme of a periodical devoted to the good of the sex, of which she was to be the editor. The chief points she then dwelt upon were, the sufferings of the *most unhappy* class of women, and the necessity of taking more pains to explain to poor girls at school the snares which encompassed them, and the utter ruin to which one false step exposed them. In this I zealously concurred. . . . So far, and only so far, do I agree in any opinions peculiarly hers. . . . I impute to her no designed misrepresentations, but she is a visionary who, in more senses than one, turns a deaf ear to all objections and remonstrances; takes silence for concurrence, and imagines that all who show some friendly interest in her must of necessity be her *disciples* in all the force of the term.'—Pp. 362, 363.

In certain points of morals Miss Aikin was strictly bound to received prescriptive ideas, from which the transcendental ladies of our own day feel themselves emancipated. She had a wholesome fear of bad books; has even doubts of the propriety of ordering 'Corinne' into the book society, hearing that Mme. de Stäel is tinctured by Rousseau's 'virtue in words, and vice in action.' With horror she tells of the many French governesses that instruct our innocent girls, and shudders at French novels in a way that Mrs. Browning and Miss Fuller would have thought

exceedingly narrow-minded. Yet the looseness with which she acquiesced in all matters of belief was the natural forerunner of relaxation of moral restraint; and the woman who in her zeal for her sex's political status could pronounce against the vow of conjugal obedience, and rejoice in the change of the marriage law because that 'immoral vow was no longer an essential of the marriage rite,' was doing her part to weaken old restraints, and to introduce ideas of licence from which personally she would have recoiled.

A change of tone on this and other points is perceptible when American influences are brought to bear. The whole Unitarian party seem to have welcomed the "spiritualism of the New England development of their school as a relief from the utilitarianism and cold reason with which it had so long contented itself. This is shown in her reports to Dr. Channing of the feeling excited by his works, and the chord he had struck in all hearts:—

'The oldest minister of the Scotch Church, Mr. Somerville, author of a valuable history of the reign of Queen Anne, died very lately at above ninety, but possessed of all his faculties. The venerable man uttered his "nunc dimittis" on having witnessed Catholic emancipation; but one more triumph was in store for him in the perusal of your works—he said he rejoiced in them exceedingly; they formed an era in the progress of religion. This trait I have from his accomplished daughter-in-law, also a great admirer of yours. She is an eminent proficient in mathematical science, and now engaged in translating the works of La Place, and her countrywoman Joanna Baillie is no more modest, gentle, and full of all goodness.'—P. 212.

His more ardent style is expected to make converts from scepticism; and the ladies of their set rejoiced in the warmth of feeling his system allowed them:—

'The impression you have produced on the minds of *women* is one for which I bless God from the bottom of my heart. I need not tell you how precious your teaching is in the eyes of Joanna Baillie, and I have long since, I think, told you that admirable Mrs. Somerville was your zealous disciple (but make the Farrars tell you more of her). I have now to mention that you have another in Mrs. Marcet.'—P. 256.

And for herself she answers in as warm a strain of thankful observation:—

'From the time that I first became your reader, I had a kind of anticipation that you would work considerable effects upon me; but it has been by slow degrees, and laborious processes, and hard struggles with deep-rooted prepossessions, that I have fitted my mind to give reception to so many of your views; and, but for the deep interest in them which your letters assisted to maintain, my resolution would have failed me ere the task was thus far accomplished. You have wished to interest in religion minds by which it was apt to be coldly regarded. With respect to mine, you have all that you desire; for the present I am little interested in any other subject; or at least, I view all others as connected with this, and subordinate to it. May God reward you! You have given me a new being.'—P. 244, 245.

One poor dying girl she describes as longing to be 'under

'the observation of Dr. Channing, and speculating upon the 'nature of the advice he would have pressed upon her:' that is yearning for the comfort of a spiritual adviser, a want which English Unitarianism does not suggest to its communion. Miss Aikin herself seems to find the sensation a wholly new one of leaning upon and seeking the guidance of another mind in her religious sentiment. It is a new idea and experience to her, but not the less a very pleasant and congenial one. With all the commonplaces of priestcraft at her fingers' ends, the clerical standing of Dr. Channing was one of his main attractions. One of their frequently recurring topics is the state of religion in England. For him she collects and treasures up all the religious gossip of the day, and gives her own views, sometimes characterised by the crass ignorance of a contemptuous outsider, frequently influenced by the irritation of seeing tracts, magazines, pamphlets, and sermons occupying such a place in men's minds that books were superseded by them for a time ;—so that she and Hallam were reduced to grumble together over the decay of literature,—and often not without sagacity. Of Unitarianism she says, in relation to his own influence :—

'My father used to say of the popular systems, that they *bid high* for mankind, and I believe mankind must become a good deal wiser before Unitarianism will be able to outbid them in the minds of the multitude; but certainly there is a progress in both countries; here it has lately been marked by the abolition of our test laws, and you go on founding Unitarian churches. The celebrated political economist Malthus, a clergyman, but a liberal—for he was brought up under my liberal grandfather at Warrington, and has always acted with our Whigs—slid into his pocket the other day my copy of your dedication sermon, saying, "It is a system which every good mind must wish to be true, but I think there are considerable difficulties from some of the texts." I have not yet had the opportunity of inquiring whether you have removed his difficulties.'—Pp. 188, 189:

In another place she has lamented over the decay of dissent which had elicited further inquiry from him :—

'When I lamented the decline of dissent, I had in my mind that of Presbyterianism chiefly—that is, of the only sect which could boast of learned ministers, and which once included in its bosom a very considerable body of wealthy and well-educated and enlightened families.

As for the other old denominations, the Independents and the Baptists, they are by no means declining in numbers. Formerly their congregations were seldom found but in towns, and the trading classes, but I am now told that there is scarcely a rural village throughout the country in which either they or the Methodists, under some of their subdivisions, have not some humble place of worship. They reckon, I believe, by hundreds of thousands. But in this aristocratic country, as you truly call it, numbers *alone* stand for little or nothing. These dissenters have no political power or weight whatever, as their ministers have confessed or complained. They have not even a single member of parliament belonging to them, while the little Unitarian aristocracy has about fifteen. Their opinions are, I believe, Calvinistic to a high degree, and



it is only as persons asserting practically the right of private judgment in religion, that it is possible to prefer them to the members of the establishment. . . .

'It may a little illustrate this matter to you, if I mention that full half the maid-servants I have had were either some kind of methodists or regular dissenters; and I believe this to be general. You see from this, that there is no apparent tendency to what you would call pure Christianity in our lower classes—except, indeed, that among the Baptists there are, or were, some Unitarians.'—Pp. 425, 426.

In one place she speaks of the literary class (1834) being mainly for Church and State, which, so far as it was true then, argues a change for the worse. But Dr. Channing was clearly looked to as the man to set all this right.

The transcendental theory of a progressive Christianity is expected to infuse new life into liberalism:—

'Of the sermon I may truly say, that it was by far the noblest view of the Christian religion ever offered to my mind, and the most persuasive; it derives a novelty and originality from its sublimity, its purity, and its simplicity; it is worthy the most philosophic minds, the most enlightened ages, and I regard it as the best illustration of the idea of a *progressive Christianity* thrown out, as I remember, but not sufficiently unfolded, by that virtuous and accomplished, though not always judicious man and writer, Gilbert Wakefield.'—P. 192.

She discusses Church parties at a point of distance from both the 'Evangelicals' and the High Church movement, which is curious in the contemptuous absence of sympathy towards both. It is strange, indeed, that a person so much in the world should be so utterly removed as she seems to have been from the softening influences of personal contact. She treats both parties as though it was impossible either should possess common honesty, or any real belief in their professed opinions. Dr. Channing while in England had himself met Wilberforce, and been favourably impressed:—

'I have had a letter (1838) from Dr. Channing, in which, among other agreeable matters, he gives me a pleasing account of a visit which he made while in England to Mr. Wilberforce. "I could not but respect him," he says, "though I saw not a sign of intellectual force. He asked me about the Unitarians of Boston, not suspecting me of the heresy; and when I told him that I was one, though some of his family did not receive the communication with the kindness which hospitality required, the good old man went on to talk with undiminished complacency. On my leaving him, he took me into his study, gave me to understand that he thought more of a man's spirit or temper than his opinions, and chose to write my name and his own on a pamphlet, which he presented to me as a memorial of our interview."—P. 156.

This sounds candid in the original writer and the transcriber, but Wilberforce was a layman, and had other claims on their toleration. It is certain that neither Dr. Channing nor the lady were above regarding most bishops, and almost every clergyman, as such, as a sort of monster. Dr. Whately she could endure, because he was not like a bishop, and delighted in defying the conventional notion of one; and Hampden she

patronises on supposed congeniality of views, and one or two more :—

"You think quite as well of our bishops as they deserve. The venerable Bishop of Norwich, of whom Sydney Smith happily said, "he should *touch* for bigotry and absurdity," stands very much alone amongst them ; however, I do not wish them hurt in the least, nor frightened further than is necessary to urge them to quit their political station. The separation of Church and State is, in my opinion, by much the most important victory which the people have still to achieve. When our bishops shall be in the state of your bishops, certainly my animosity against them will extend "not a frown further," but till that happens, all fair means of lessening them in the eyes of the people must be allowed."—P. 269.

Her set she describes as wholly removed from not only the influence, but the slightest acquaintance with the theological train of thought expressed at that time with such remarkable power. This is her picture of the state of things twenty-five years back, as found in the society of steady lawyers and liberal men of letters :—

'Our clergy are desperately active at present, and proportionally mischievous. They will not allow us to have a normal school on terms of anything like fairness to dissenters, and they everywhere talk very big of "the authority committed unto them" as the successors of the apostles. I have even heard of attempts amongst them to remind people of a monstrous old law, made against Popish recusants, and still unrepealed, by which persons are liable to heavy penalties for not regularly attending their parish church. I apprehend, however, that this applies now only to church people, the toleration act sheltering dissenters. They have "all the plea" at present ; the press seems as much their own as if they had an inquisition at their command. But let them beware of what is gathering in silence. Men *think* very freely now, and whisper ; presently they will speak out and act, I trust. If you take up a list of new publications, it seems as if nothing scarcely was written or read amongst us except theology, and of the narrowest kind ; but so it is, that a person might live in the midst of the best and most literary society for a year together, and never hear the slightest mention of any one new book on these subjects. I know not exactly who are the readers, but I suspect scarcely any laymen of the smallest note. The clergy often write *at* the bishop or the patron, not the public, and there are a number of women who write theology for little children, which some mammas encourage.'—P. 394.

The ultra-liberals were, we know, not the only prophets of the outbreak of scepticism which we see in our own time, and which is here anticipated ; but she is certainly right that the whisperers of the last generation have spoken out.

The utilitarian school in which she had been reared and the society in which she lived, had all contributed to her utter ignorance of the condition of the labouring and poorer classes ; and the efforts of religious parties at home to stir the rich to a sense of their duty in this respect had all excited her suspicion and contempt. The efforts of ladies in this direction are attributed to fussiness, love of patronage, and of management ; and are considered to produce much mischief. The poor are alternately represented as resenting impertinent interferences, as

led into greater depths of ignorance and fanaticism by fanatical guides, and as lapsing into improvidence and drunkenness under the deluge of indiscriminate alms lavished upon them. But when Dr. Channing urges a change of tone in his own society on this point, her feelings take a different direction. She is awake to the extreme insensibility the higher classes were apt to show to their inferiors, and is ready to apprehend serious natural ill results from it. At the time of the cholera, in 1831, she writes thus:—the good man she speaks of it is no want of charity to suspect might be Malthus. On the 'fatal aristocratic influence' she changed her mind subsequently:—

'The poor in some European countries through which this scourge has passed, were possessed with the notion that it was purposely diffused by the higher classes to thin the number of the lower. I doubt not there was *talk* which showed at least profound indifference in the rich and great to this result, and unless people set a strong guard on their tongues, the same suspicions may arise here. It is felt that we have many spare hands. I have heard a good man say, that a decimation of London, if the lots fell *well*, would be no bad thing. But luckily there can be no security that the lots would so fall, if once the infection gained ground; and *therefore* we are cleansing the dwellings of the poor, and wrapping their persons in flannel; but is there not something frightful in this worthlessness of the lives of one class to another? What wonder that kings have made no spare of blood of their subjects? I perceive more and more clearly what you first pointed out to me—the darkening effects of the spirit of aristocracy on the mind, its hardening influence on the heart. Distinct classes can never feel for each other as members of one body; and, in the want of this sympathy, all anti-social vices, oppression, arrogance, cruelty in the rich, envy, fraud, rapacity, and brutal insolence in the poor, take root and flourish.'—P. 245.

She declares herself in another place quite enlightened by Dr. Channing's views of how to act towards the poor; candidly avows her old opinions were not the result of personal knowledge, and, perhaps secretly swayed by a wish that every exertion of her own would be useless, ends by confessions of regret that her acquaintance with her own countrymen should be so strictly confined to one class. Upon the subject of differences of ranks, which is so constantly brought forward in this work, we observe a marked change between the time Miss Aikin formed her opinions and our own. One, or perhaps more strictly two generations past, the respect and reverence—often approaching to adulation—of rank in one party, was matched by a bitter democratic levelling sentiment on the liberal side, which has almost disappeared amongst us. Nobody in society is bitter against lords and ladies in our day, and perhaps nobody worships them with a far-off reverence.

Miss Aikin could remember when she hated the aristocracy—a very different impression is given of her latest feeling in this particular. It was necessary in discussing such a topic with Dr. Channing to preserve a high philosophic line; but it

is clear that the society of well-bred persons—and she is distinct in assigning to the aristocracy the palm in this particular—afforded her a very high gratification. She could not with any consistency defend an aristocracy as a public benefit in the essentials of good government; but she stands out with her correspondent that he can properly know nothing about perfect manners without an acquaintance with persons of rank. These points—points of manner, propriety, elegance, grace of diction, all that gives social intercourse its final charm—as being a woman's peculiar subjects, on which she feels her judgment more than equal with man's, were, in fact, as interesting to her as the bolder range of topics on which her pen expatiated so frequently. In advocating writing above reading, as concentrating thought and giving strength to conviction, she looks back regretfully to her writing days, and fancies her mind has grown to a thinner consistency; and, recurring to some favourite passage in her histories, says somewhere, 'Surely I was a *man* when I wrote that, who am now a mere old woman;' but in fact her pen never better knows what it is about or expresses a distinct personal opinion with so much authority, as when, laying her manly republicanism by, she discusses a purely feminine topic with the confidence that she is on her own ground. Dr. Channing (in 1842) had ventured on some reflections on the masculine character of Englishwomen,—perhaps bearing on her previous avowal of zeal in the cause of woman's rights,—which then at least were undeserved. He had talked of their *stride*, *strong gesture*, and bad manners. Her reply is given with a spirit of independence which she could scarcely have mustered in any other cause. She rejoices in the emancipation of woman from the mincing, tight-laced helplessness of former days, and boasts of the bloom, the active habits, natural manners, and good constitutions of her countrywomen in contrast with his:—

'If your fair daughters would also learn to *step out*, their bloom would be less transient, and fewer would fill untimely graves. I admit, indeed, *some* unnecessary inelegance in the step of our pedestrian fair ones; but this does not extend to ladies of quality, or *real* gentlewomen, who take the air chiefly in carriages, or on horseback. They walk with the same quiet grace that pervades all their deportment, and to which you have seen nothing similar or comparable. When you mention our '*stronger gestures*,' I know not what you mean. All Europe declares that we have *no* gesture. Madame de Staël ridiculed us as mere pieces of still life; and of *untravelling* gentlewomen this is certainly true in general. All governesses proscribe it. Where it exists, it arises from personal character. I have seen it engaging when the offspring of a lively imagination and warm feelings, repulsive when the result of a keen temper or dictatorial assumption. Again, your charge of want of delicacy I cannot understand. The women of every other European nation charge us with prudery, and I really cannot conceive of a human being more unassailable by just reproach on this head than a well-conducted Englishwoman. We have

indeed heard some whimsical stories of American damsels who would not for the world speak of the *leg* even of a table, or the *back* even of a chair; and I do confess that we are not delicate or indelicate to this point. But if you mean to allude to the enormities of Frances Wright, or even to some of the discussions of ———, I can only answer, we blush too. Be pleased to consider that you have yet seen in your country none of our ladies of high rank; and few of your people, except diplomatic characters, have had more than very transient glimpses of them here, while we have had the heads of your society with us. Now I must frankly tell you, in reference to your very unexpected claim for your countrywomen of superior refinement, that although I have seen several of them whose manners were too quiet and retiring to give the least offence, I have neither seen nor heard of any who, even in the society of our middle classes, were thought entitled to more than this negative commendation—any who have become prominent without betraying gross ignorance of more than conventional good breeding. The very tone of the voice, the accent and the choice of phrase, give us the impression of extreme inelegance. Patriot and staunch republican as you are, I think you must admit the *à priori* probability that the metropolis of the British empire, the first city in the world for size, for opulence, for diffusion of comforts, accommodations, and luxuries of life, as well as for all the appliances of science, literature, and taste—the seat of a court unexcelled in splendour, and of an aristocracy absolutely unrivalled in wealth, in substantial power and dignity, and especially in mental cultivation of the most solid and most elegant kind—would afford such a standard of graceful and finished manners as your state capitals can have no chance of coming up to. Further: it has been most truly observed that in every country it is the *mothers* who give the tone both to morals and manners; but with you the mothers are by your own account the *toilers*. Oppressed with the cares of house and children, they either retire from society into the bosom of their family, or leave at least the active and prominent parts in it to mere girls: and can you suppose that the *art and science* of good breeding, for such it is, will be likely to advance towards perfection when all who have attained such proficiency as experience can give resign the sway to giddy novices? With us it is quite different. Young ladies do not *come out* till eighteen, and then their part is a very subordinate one. It is the matron who does the honours of her house, and supports conversation; and her daughters pay their visits beneath her wing. Under wholesome restraint like this, the young best learn self-government. “Sir,” said Dr. Parr, when provoked by the ill manners of a rich man who had been a spoiled child, “it is discipline that makes the scholar, discipline that makes the gentleman, and it is the want of discipline that makes you what you are.”

‘One of your young women showed her taste and breeding by asking an English lady if she had seen “Victoria;” and I must mention that Miss Sedgewick has thought proper to describe the first and *greatest lady in the world* as “a plain little *body*,” adding, “ordinary is the word for her.” It was no woman, luckily, but your Mr. D——, who had the superlative conceit and impertinence to express his *surprise* to a friend of mine at finding so much good society in London. Now I think I have given you enough for one letter.’—Pp. 435-437.

It is only on such questions as these that Miss Aikin was not a partisan; only when she was exercising her feminine gifts of taste, quick observation, and intelligent insight into character. It is difficult to reconcile such good sense and proper feeling with passages where political and religious animosities run away with her; as in dozens of cases such as: ‘Depend upon it, the hypocrisy is to the orthodoxy in our church as ninety-

'nine to one, at the least;' but here she was talking of men of whom she knew literally nothing, except through fiercely prejudiced report. Her best powers were only developed by personal observation. Like a great many sensible people, she is not good at giving a reason. In her 'Experimental Essays,' begun under Dr. Channing's advice, who considered her especially fitted to form the minds of her countrywomen, she fails especially in proving her point. Thus, she objects to the received liking for a frank character, and then drawing a character not really frank, but impertinent under the mask of candour, proceeds to convince mankind of their mistake. In another, where she wants to expose the old saying 'Example is better than precept,' as a gross and wilful setting up of authority over reason, she illustrates her point by representing example itself as precept, that is, not as simply *doing* right, and leaving the lesson to take effect, but saying always, 'Do as I do.' Again, in the 'Spirit of Aristocracy,' a young lady is reproved for allowing her milliner to stand while she receives her orders, herself sitting; the whole point of the thing requiring that the ranks of the parties should be different, and then complicates her argument by representing the milliner, unknown to her customer, as a nobleman's granddaughter.

In one point, Miss Aikin's instincts stood by her under all temptation. Dr. Channing's eloquence induced a certain reflected enthusiasm in his disciple, now and then even an approach to flightiness under the stimulus of his optimism. She now and then expresses expectations and hopes which do not sound reasonable, but the transcendental notion of progress she could not receive. Once she goes so far as to admit, in her reverence for free institutions, that she does not know what may happen in America, but in England, the land she lived in, where her experience lay, judging by the men and women she knew, she could not believe in it. This and communism she refused as inconsistent with human nature. He talks to her of the value of a great Idea which is to remove mountains. She still is at a loss to understand his believing in a coming time when all men will be regarded by all as equal. He had approved of the aristocracy of wealth, because it broke in upon that of rank, which seemed to gall him even at this distance. She grows practical, and wishes to know if this means that she is to take tea with her 'maudlin washerwoman.' Again, she submits that while two things remain the same, the nature of God and the nature of man, while every human creature is born into the world with the same ignorance and the same appetites and passions as his earliest and rudest progenitors, she cannot see her way to that entire change in the human race her



friend looked forward to. In the same conservative spirit, she did not like the recklessness of modern scepticism, which was dawning when she wrote, and looked back with regret to the deists of the last century, who were learned, and 'too prudent' to promulgate their opinions among the vulgar,' a class for whom Miss Aikin had always a supreme contempt.

There are passages which prove Dr. Channing a prophet of civil war, which, at one time (1833), he declared his countrymen were even then on the brink of. Though he did not reach the pass of Theodore Parker, there are allusions in his sermon on war which might lead us to suppose he helped to bring about his own prediction. At this time his popularity was great in England: she is pleased to tell that one of his sermons had been preached verbatim, all but the text, in one of our churches, and is evidently gratified and amused to be the vehicle of polite messages of respect and admiration from the Duke of Sussex, which she trusts will not embarrass her democratic friend.

In the early part of her correspondence with Dr. Channing, Miss Aikin accounts for the peculiar bitterness in her mode of holding certain opinions:—

'I feel as if I were in some danger of becoming importunate to you by the frequency of my letters; but, to converse with my "guide, philosopher, and friend," has now become with me, not a mere indulgence, but a want, and I trust in your patience. It is advisedly that I have called you my guide. I daily discover more and more how much I have come under the influence of your mind, and what great things it has done, and I trust is still doing, for mine. Let me gratify the feelings of a thankful heart by entering into a few particulars on this subject. I was never duly sensible, till your writings made me so, of the transcendent beauty and sublimity of Christian morals; nor did I submit my heart and temper to their chastening and meliorating influences. In particular, the spirit of unbounded benevolence which they breathe was, I own it, a stranger to my bosom; far indeed was I from looking upon all men as my brethren. Many things prevented it. A life, for the most part, of domestic seclusion; studious pursuits, and something of the pride and fastidiousness they are apt to bring; and more than all, the atmosphere of a sect and a party, which it was my fate to breathe from childhood, narrowed my affections within strait limits. Under the notion of a generous zeal for freedom, truth, and virtue, I cherished a set of prejudices and antipathies which placed beyond the pale of my charity not the few, but the many, the mass of my compatriots. I shudder now to think how *good a hater* I was in the days of my youth. Time and reflection, a wider range of acquaintance, and a calmer state of the public mind, mitigated by degrees my bigotry; but I really knew not what it was to open my heart to the human race until I had drunk deeply into the spirit of your writings.'—Pp. 243, 244.

Illustrating the teaching of her youth, she confesses that she had had doubts of the efficacy of prayer, having lived among persons, greatly respected by her, who argued that prayer was an opposition, as it were, to the Divine will. To her his warmer and more poetical tenets brought an accession of faith

and benevolence, and the contact with transcendentalism wrought a favourable change. But a mind trained in positive convictions of any kind—a mind that is imbued with any fixed principles, opinions to hold and opinions to reject, whatever these are—is, we are disposed to think, in better training than where all is laxity and indefiniteness together.

Whether the result of nature or education, we are struck with the difference in distinctness and hold of thought between the two ladies before us. There is a stay, a seriousness, a gravity, a sense of responsibility, in Lucy Aikin, the want of which is the distinguishing feature in Miss Cobbe's prattling scepticism. It is alike impossible to ascertain what Miss Cobbe believes and what she does not believe, to decide in her case whether we are witnessing a case of universal credulity or universal unbelief. At one time she is so extremely civil as to apologise, with Miss Martineau, to Baal, for having ever held him in disesteem, and in sight of his temple to own she has made a great mistake; at another, so insolent towards the religion into which she was born, as to disparage, in one contemptuous summary, all creeds, articles, scriptures, and every existing church system, so that a simple reader might be at a loss to decide whether the religious instinct runs riot in her nature, or is wholly wanting, till he detects that the antiquarian spirit is the real impulse. *All* past religions are respectable, *all* recent ones superstition. Any religion that makes no demands on her reverence and obedience she can patronise; any faith which imposes a present obligation is the object of sarcasm and direct vituperation. All doctrine and dogma in our Church is disposed of as Calvinism, while of the religion in Italy she writes in the following sweeping style:—

'We need to recall how utterly in Italy religion and morality have been dis-severed for ages, and how religion to the uneducated Italian means nothing but the sacerdotal enchantment whereby he is to escape from future fires. Give him his *olio santo* passport to bliss, and religion has done for him all it is qualified to do. Of reformation of life, or purification of heart, of love to God or man, he has no more thought when he speaks of religion than if he were talking of the boat which is to ferry him across the river, or the *carretta* to take him to the neighbouring town. Religion is a machine for getting to heaven, and avoiding hell and purgatory. Having paid the passage money at the proper bureau, and received his ticket, his concern with it is over. He is "booked through," with the security of the official signature.'—*Italica*, p. 213.

Miss Cobbe is never troubled by misgivings. Italy is not generally considered an easy country to understand. Italians, at least, do not think so; but she has a knack at interpreting all riddles, and the happy art of condensing every case into a nutshell, through which politics and parties are quite as summarily dealt with as religion in these comprehensive volumes.

Miss Cobbe is known to the world as the English editor of Theodore Parker's works, and if Dr. Channing was Miss Aikin's priest, Parker was Miss Cobbe's prophet, with a far more implicit and unquestioning reception. This sympathetic connexion between the English female *esprit fort* and the American transcendentalist is suggestive and curious. In both cases we see the innate yearning in woman for spiritual direction, however self-reliant, or grotesque in its manifestation, where its obvious authorised satisfaction is contemned. In Miss Cobbe we have an example how a mind under this form of domination will receive the dicta of its idol with an acceptance in proportion as it is self-chosen and a mark of self-will.

Miss Cobbe adopts all her teacher's views with an emphasis almost beyond that of their first promulgator; but there is this difference between the master and disciple, that she has her sex's emancipation from existing trammels more at heart than it is man's nature to sympathize with. Every man, Theodore Parker among them, loved at bottom the domestic type in woman. No 'strong-minded' woman, not even the sensible Miss Aikin, is content with this position for her sex; as for Miss Cobbe, she gives women a place in the scheme of progress which she herself can only express. What it quite means is not so clear, but if vague, it is not the less lofty in its ambition. We extract from her '*Cities of the Past*':—

'In the following pages I shall endeavour to give a brief account of what a woman may easily see and do alone in Palestine, and thus, I trust, encourage my countrywomen to undertake the journey more frequently in future, whether with or without companions. Especially does it seem desirable that women should seek by these and all other modes of study to fit themselves for their proper part in sharing the progress of human thought in our age. Too often have their limited lives, their scope of vision—narrowed artificially by education as well as naturally by circumstances, and the timid conservatism which seems a part of the female temperament—too often have all these courses made women the champion of antiquated prejudices, the cruel enemies of every newborn truth. But the test to which they are called is the very opposite of all this. Women ought to be the torch-bearers in the pageant of humanity, lighting men onward in their noble pursuit of truth. Hitherto they have represented only the principles of spiritual carefulness, of a timidity in religious things, which wears the garb of faith, but is, in truth, full of injurious doubts and fears. Hereafter they must become the representatives of healthful aspiration, of the largest and widest human sympathies, and of faith in its real sense—faith, not in the lessons of the nursery and the schoolroom, but in those eternal verities of the Divine existence, and love, and righteousness, towards which every lesser truth is a path to lead us up. The night is past when it might have been permitted to close our doors, and sit cowering over the light of our tapers. It is a pitiful thing to see women rising up now in the dawning day, only to draw down the blinds and shut the casement whenever they hear any one cry, "Behold the morning."—*Cities of the Past*, p. 176.

Why galloping about Palestine by themselves should so materially assist women to be 'torch-bearers' is not very clear.

We may certainly say that it does not appear to have aided Miss Cobbe in that concentration of thought which is so needful for securing any strong hold over other minds. There is a ready-for-anything attitude characterising certain women of our time, which independence of old restraints undoubtedly fosters; and so far as woman renounces her prescriptive conservative influence, and her weight is lost in that scale, her example may tell in another direction; but women will not really have more power in society by such a line as Miss Cobbe advocates. She herself is an example how the unrestraint she advocates disorganises the mind. She is a very clever woman, but we see that the rambling, disjointed, self-sufficient habits her principles of life induce, the strange roaming discursive turn they encourage, are rapidly disqualifying her from using her powers to any purpose, and rendering her an ally no party cares for. There is often great amiability, what is called geniality, in her writing, but the way she treats all great subjects proves an utter absence of seriousness. She has something to say about everything, partly due to her ready observation and quickness of thought, and in graver themes from a shallowness that never allows her to see her incompetence to form an opinion worth the reader's attention. No topic is too grave or sacred not to be dragged into a digression. All awe and reverence is quenched. Her subject and her way of treating it are, in fact, illustrated by a testimonial which she records with much satisfaction—a vote of thanks from her fellow travellers to the Dead Sea, for her 'unvarying hilarity.' To us her books are an illustration of the danger of familiarising ourselves with sacred scenes in a trifling frame of mind. Of course the familiarising process is what she deems so desirable, as, in fact, all people feel themselves enlightened when they lose an old check or restraint. She thinks it original, independent, unshackled, in surveying Jerusalem for the first time, to fall into raptures with the Mosque of Omar, and turn Moslem on the spot. With these people all past fanaticism is religion, all present strictness of belief imposture. In the frame of mind induced by Mahomet's career, she can even allow the Hebrew prophet who cried, 'Thus saith the Lord,' to have been only piously mistaken. 'Were these assertions of divine assistance impostures? Were they even false, judged by a philosophy which should include both primary and secondary causes?'

There is no more fatal habit for effect than desultoriness. The perpetual rambling liberalism in which this lady's mind is steeped induces a constant dissolution, as it were—every theory loses its edges and slips away. Miss Cobbe writes of very interesting scenes, has a lively mind, and unusual facility of

expressing her thoughts; but the impossibility of viewing anything for itself, or confining herself to the things before her, renders her books unreadable after a time. The faintest mention of anything extraneous carries her off at a tangent. It is as if a reverie might be photographed; and a reverie really not suggested on the spot, but subsequently, at her desk, with the treacherous pen in hand. Take the chapter headed 'A Day at the Dead Sea.' There is some good description, but whatever is good is short and incomplete. The substance of the chapter is made up entirely of digression. The labour of keeping to the point is not possible beyond a very few lines at a time, and the mind is always too busy—even on the spot—with a view of interpretation or application, to observe long enough to take anything in vividly. The actual description of the Dead Sea and its shores does not fill three quarters of a page; the bathing and its consequences another three quarters. About as much space is given to her impressions of the River Jordan, and spreading around these oases of fact and picture are sandy tracts of the most irrelevant matter in the world. Thus, a satire upon Southerners for comparing the River Jordan to the Mississippi, because it is not at all like it, brings in a homage to the kindness of all Northerners whom she met in her travels. Every sight she sees is dismissed summarily to describe something else she saw once. A group of pilgrims by the Jordan reminds her of a group of women she had seen in Athens; these suggest to her how natural pilgrimages are to humanity; thence to crusades, thence to a definition of duty and conscience, thence to the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' an apostrophe to 'good old Bunyan,' and a critique of his allegory; and last, as though she had now reached her goal, a story of a little girl who once acted out Christian's journey, ascended the Hill Difficulty, and took a footman in livery for the porter Discretion. Each digression has its digression, and these their own digressional parasites, and a great deal of this, we think, owing to the notion that, as torch-bearer, she must let no opportunity go by of casting her especial illumination on the reader. It is also a consequence of that exceeding familiarity cultivated towards every person and thing. Everything is taken liberties with. It is patronage and superiority, regardless of forms and respects, condescending to our level. We are her 'poor dear readers,' who must be amused and enlightened, as it is 'dear old Pisa,' and 'poor little Nervi.'

Miss Cobbe is very much alive to the benefit and enlargement of mind to be derived from travel, but her own system of composition must suggest to many of her readers a different

train of reflection. There is a clear analogy between the freedom of unrestrained movement she recommends to her sex both by precept and example, the independence of all the old defences and safeguards hitherto thought desirable and due to physical weakness, the defiance of the domestic and stay-at-home idea, and the reckless discursiveness of her style. We at least see a connexion between the inability to keep to her subject, pen in hand, the range over all things relevant and irrelevant, and the practice of scampering, for days together, without other escort than wild Arabs. We are not denying that it is a spirited thing to do, but we believe that the feminine pen will do its work better—though it may have less to tell—when it is regarded by its possessor as a domestic implement, and when the mind itself has a certain domesticity of range. We feel as if the following passage could not have been written by a woman who had not taken strong measures to divest herself of the feminine turn of thought. To be advised by a woman not to think too much about heaven, strikes us as in a particular degree unnatural; but as there is something in the connexion of heaven and home, there may be a fitness in a *citoyenne* of the world preaching such doctrines:—

‘When shall we shake off this effeminate yearning for peace and bliss, and know that it ought to be

“Life, not Death, for which we pant,  
More Life, and fuller, *that* we want.”

‘... The teaching of the miserable theology of the last century infects us still, though there are signs on every hand that we are outgrowing it. The doctrine which Paley taught so lucidly that “Virtue consists in doing right for the *sake of everlasting felicity*,” is, perhaps, rarely preached now in all the effrontery of its baseness.

‘Only to one class of human beings, I believe, is it well to speak much of heaven. To those among us whose lot is mainly a happy one, the sense of immortality is fitly placed in the background of consciousness . . . and it is not desirable for *us* that we should force this consciousness into more vivid prominence. But to our unhappy brothers and sisters whose earthly lives are steeped in vice and squalor; whose homes are the crowded lodging-rooms of hideous lanes, where the moral atmosphere and the natural air are alike tainted by the foulest filth, in these *is* need we should speak of another life.’—*Cities of the Past*, p. 14.

That is, Lazarus may think of heaven because here he has his evil things, but Dives has no need. No doubt optimism has much to do with this. It is observable of all millenarian enthusiasm, that it causes the mind to stop short of heaven and eternity in its speculation. The believers in progress have their millenium, and their faith is to be confirmed by Miss Cobbe’s one recipe of travel, travel undertaken with the intention of finding what it seeks for. After a denunciation of atheism, she writes:—



'The bare statements of such thoughts is surely their refutation, and rather we must believe that each advance in knowledge will help forward that nobler faith which is to come—that faith of the future which will not be the extinguishing of the past religions, but the essential life of them, all revived in an immortal resurrection.

"One accent of the Holy Ghost  
The heedless world hath never lost."

The time will come when every ray ever shed upon human souls will be gathered and absorbed into a resplendent focus of truth and glory. Only let us go forth seeking these rays, not seeking for blots and stains. Let us go to other nations and churches, not to notice complacently where they err, or where we are wiser than they—where they cry "Allah, Allah!" and we say, "Lord, Lord;" but let us go to them and see what truth is there; what worthy thought of God, what high sense of duty to man, is at the basis of their faith; what is it which this sect has taught, which has enabled it to supply millions of souls with spiritual food for ages? No mere chaff can do this. There must need be many grains of wheat where men live and grow.'—*Cities of the Past*, p. 63.

In her '*Italics*,' Miss Cobbe plunges into Italian religion and politics in her own style of flowing gossip, sometimes amusing, as in the chapter, 'People one in Italy,' where are congregated so many persons of wit, genius, and *bonhomie*, that poor stay-at-homes are in danger of thinking that human nature must be quite a different thing out there; and sometimes altogether tedious and unsatisfactory; for, added to the desultory mode of treatment, the reader acquires a growing mistrust of her statements, as prejudice and credulity become more evident. There is a paper, entitled the '*Nemesis of Woman*,' in which, from her emancipated height, she reproaches men with keeping all the infidelity and scepticism to themselves, and encouraging in women what she calls the worship of Mumbo Jumbo. What this worship is she does not distinctly explain, but it includes all that sceptical gentlemen do not themselves believe, but which they are so unjust as to wish their wives and daughters to have faith in. The *cultus* is most conspicuous, she allows, in Italy; but her own countrymen are the real objects of her indignation. Of course, for the men—and there are many such—who want their wives to believe more than they do themselves, we have nothing to say. The ladies have certainly a right to turn upon them for their inconsistency, if they care to do so. Nevertheless, we are glad to find that even in the world with which this lady is familiar, she finds such cause of complaint as the following. She is speaking of English society:—

'A governess or schoolmistress who should admit herself to have latitudinarian ideas, or even to have an acquaintance with works of German, French, and English free-criticism, would hardly succeed in obtaining pupils in one family in a thousand. A young English lady of twenty or five and twenty years of age has gone usually through a course which would be absolutely suited to its object were it the deliberate purpose of her parents to make her as narrow-minded and bigoted as possible. She has had her memory and

imagination cultivated, but hardly ever her reasoning powers. She knows a good deal of history, biography, music, and drawing, but nothing of logic, geometry, or the various philosophical and religious systems of the world: she has attended the places of worship of her own sect, never those of any other, she has read works to instil one set of opinions, and never opened those which dispute them; she has seen dozens of people who either believe as she has been taught to do, or in her presence sedulously restrain a word or smile which should betray a doubt of them. . . . Where does this come from? Why do men wish their daughters, sisters, wives, to believe more than they do themselves? What pleasure can it be to them to keep them outside of their deepest interests, incapable of sharing with them their greatest rights? There are several reasons for it all. Some of these are vain and sentimental; feminine debility and dependence of mind is the correlative of that physical weakness and cowardice which some men seem to need to throw into relief their own strength and courage. A learned woman, a logical woman, a large thoughted woman, distresses them by failing in her own vocation in this way, and not allowing their Eton grammar and Aldridge, and even by audacity of scepticism, almost Balaam or the Flood to stand out in proper splendour of contrast.—*Italics*, p. 243.

Some sceptics may not wish their wives to be sceptics, but the real answer to all this is, that the state of feeling in women argues that such writers as Miss Cobbe enormously overstate the number of sceptics in our day. Almost all people in doubt like to talk about their doubts, while people *not* visited by doubt never think of saying so. It is a matter of course. No doubt, in certain circles, there is much of this sort of talk; but we wish we could agree with Miss Cobbe, that in these circles the women were in strong opposition to the tone about them. When doubt and scepticism are in fashion, there will be found women to take them up, to chatter about Dr. Colenso at parties, to announce, with pretty shudders, in the intervals of the dance, that they feel the crisis at hand, and the ground of old faith giving way under them. In such cases as these, it is not Miss Cobbe's arguments that we suspect of having wrought the mischief to such ground of faith as the fair dancer had ever trusted herself to, but the influence of her partner. It is very true that women have many safeguards against unbelief in their own nature, but it is also true that there are women so frivolous, that faith and scepticism alike are regarded by them mainly as things to talk about, and out of which they may extract matter for attraction and favour.

There is a point that ladies discontented with the position of their sex would do well to consider. As writers and talkers, they should be able, on fitting occasions, to forget self in their subject. Men are not always thinking they are men; but women of this class are always obtruding upon us that they are women. There is at once weakness and vanity in the habit. A hundred topics are better discussed without this intrusion of another consideration; and all writers, if they

would have weight, should show a mind with wings strong enough to soar above circumstances. The remembrance of sex is of the very essence of digression. There is a perpetual appeal to gallantry in the paraded consciousness of unusual effort. There is tacit admission of weakness, either in the individual or in the sex she would raise, in the aim at exciting surprise, and especially in the evident triumph at being where never woman had been before, in doing what no woman ever did before, or, as in the case before us, thinking with more boldness and mannishness than women have hitherto dared to do. There is all the difference between the proper natural influence of sex, and being occupied with the consciousness of it. The one assists a woman to choose the work suited to her mental organization, the other induces a conscious emulation and a selection of tasks which shall indulge these feelings and promote a contention, half rivalry, half flirtation. Of the two ladies before us, this stricture applies mainly to the last. In matters of thought, judgment, and severe reason, we do not see that Miss Cobbe has done much to narrow the distance so jealously measured between the strong-minded woman and her so-called oppressor. We are much mistaken if the impression left by her books on readers of either sex and of all shades of opinion is not the same—that of a clever woman out of her depth, and airy and voluble in proportion to her slight hold of the subjects she assumes herself to have mastered.

---

ART. V.—*A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the First Four Centuries.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, M.A. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Macmillan & Co.

IN these days we hear much of progress. Probably no preceding period ever was so conscious of its own superiority. Certainly none ever had so much to say in justification of this complacency. But in the notions that are current on the subject, there is, as usual, a mixture of truth and error; sometimes in very unequal measure. Pascal's famous paradox, for instance, that ancient times are really the childhood of the world, modern times its old age, is triumphantly reiterated by superficial philosophers like Whately, very often in a sense which it will not bear. When the din of the trumpet heralding the grand discovery is stilled for a moment, and leisure left for reflection, the lurking fallacy is detected. While professing to correct one vulgar error, they commit themselves to another. The saying which they misquote till it is threadbare is true in one sense only. A man living 2,000 years ago stands to a man of this century in the relation of a child to an old man, as being, of necessity, without the benefit of that experience which he lives too soon to enjoy. On the other hand, whatever of custom or opinion comes down to posterity from early times, comes in all the hoariness of age, tried and tested by length of years, venerable because of its antiquity. The invention of to-day—whether good or bad, remains to be proved—is, at all events, of recent birth, in its babyhood at present, and therefore devoid of any prescriptive title to acceptance or respect. Like a person with no hereditary honours, it has to start entirely on its merits. It must approve itself to the world, and establish its own position there, simply by what it is, without the adventitious aid of a recommendation from the past.

But there is another very important distinction too often disregarded. Without question, this vaunted progress is a fact, within certain limitations. The grown man, unless he is a downright fool, is continually advancing in every kind of knowledge which depends on *experience*. So in the history of mankind each succeeding generation can turn to account, if it will, the gathered results of previous experiments. It learns a

lesson from the mistakes and failures of its predecessors as well as from their good guessings. It is for ever ascending on 'the stepping-stone of its dead self' to a yet higher vantage-ground. But—and let it be noted carefully as a fundamental law—this takes place only in those matters where experience is our guide. The neglect of this essential limitation leads to an almost hopeless confusion in our ideas about progress.

In mechanics, in chemistry, in geology, and, briefly, in all that appertains to the material world, the nineteenth century must be vastly in advance of its forefathers, or there must be a fault somewhere. Again, in that border-territory, which partly at least owns the dominion of experience, time can hardly fail to involve progress and improvement. In the science, for example, of political economy, experience has no mean part to play, in adjusting and reconciling principles as old as the hills to the new complications of material circumstance, which act upon social life, and are, again, reacted upon by it. Accordingly we find progress here also. But when we come to those more abstract departments of knowledge, which treat of things immaterial, as pure mathematics and mental philosophy, we no longer meet with corresponding signs of progress. Nor is it to be expected. A certain degree of material civilization indeed these sciences may require for their development, and for existing at all; but they do not necessarily keep pace with its strides, as it marches onwards. Euclid and Aristotle have not yet been supplanted and superseded by later discoverers; nor are they likely to be. So in the domain of the imagination, in the arts which clothe and adorn the ungraceful nakedness of man's terrestrial life. Homer and Dante, Shakespeare and Milton still sit in undisturbed majesty on their thrones. So, too, in what may be called materialized poetry. The chisel and the brush are evidently more dependent than the poet's unfettered fancies, on the material circumstances around them. Yet even here the mind reverts instinctively to the past. The statuary of ancient Greece, the paintings of mediæval Italy, are still the acknowledged types of beauty and power to an age that is far more highly civilized. Lastly, in the science of Ethics, though time, or rather civilization may develop a more enlightened regard to self-interest—a poor and feeble restraint, at best, on man's rebellious passions—it cannot do more. Thus far it may attain, but no farther. It cannot lift itself to the level of pure unselfishness, of a disinterested sense of the obligations of duty. There is a line drawn, like that which marks the highest rising of the tides, beyond which it cannot pass. If it succeed in exorcising some forms of vice, it brings others, an evil compensation, in its train. Thus a wide and careful survey shows that

the boast of progress can only be substantiated with considerable qualification. The vague, illusive idea shrinks into smaller dimensions when we grasp it. Progress in some respects there is positively none. In others, it is found, on a closer inspection, to be very like what the Irishman called 'a progress backward.' At most and at best it is but the ramification of certain unchanging first principles within a prescribed sphere.

There is, however, a yet further distinction, and one of paramount importance, if we wish to understand clearly what progress is, and what it is not. Yet this also is too often repudiated practically, if not in so many words. When our knowledge is of a kind which cannot be acquired by mere experience, because it transcends our faculties ; when it comes to us, not in any degree through the gradual workings of experiment, but by direct communication from a source extraneous and superior to ourselves, then it is given once for all. By its very nature it is stationary, not progressive, until, at least, it shall be reversed or remodelled by a new revelation. Thus the precepts of Christianity may appear to be modified by contact with the outer world, by the conditions to which they are subjected at any given moment, but they are not really changed. They may encourage the monastic life as an indispensable refuge amid the turbulence of a rude and violent age, or the community of goods as a bond of union appropriate to a Church consisting of a few persecuted members. But the principle remains the same, though it may seem to vary ; it is simply the primary obligation of love to God, of love to man. There is nothing of change or progress in the precepts of Christianity. Still less can there be any change or progress in its doctrines. Its morality indeed, though infinitely purified and elevated, because it partakes of His divine nature who brought it into the world, is yet in a rudimentary form the common property of mankind. Its doctrines are essentially what reason could never have known without revelation. Without that, these heavenly truths would have remained hidden from men to this day. There is no occasion now to recapitulate the credentials of Him, by whose lips they were revealed. It suffices for the present argument to say, once for all, that in a revealed religion, if the fact of the revelation be once admitted, progress, in the proper sense of the word, whether as regards doctrine or precept, is out of the question, until a new revelation shall be given.

Yet there are not a few now-a-days who loudly and arrogantly proclaim a progress of this kind. They are fond of citing, in a sense which its author never intended, Bacon's quaint apophthegm, that a dwarf standing on a giant's shoulders can see further than the giant. But the illustration itself confutes them



admirably. For the question is not here of seeing, but of hearing. The knowledge in question is not that which the mental vision gains for itself, but that which is imparted as by a voice breathing its utterances into the ear. Who will say, that Apostles and men of sub-apostolic times had not an advantage in their proximity to the great Author of Christianity, which no acuteness of modern criticism can countervail, however far-sighted it may be, and though it may stand on a commanding eminence, armed with all its appliances for gazing back into the past? Without taking into account whatever of especial guidance may have been vouchsafed to some of them, the mere fact that the faith of the Christian Church is transmitted by an authenticated tradition from those who were nearest to the source whence it flowed, ought to silence all who take upon themselves to refashion and rehabilitate it, with their 'free-handling.'

The assailant of the Christian Faith, it is remarked often, has changed his mode of onset. Christianity is no longer impugned as false, utterly false from its beginning. But we are told, that it has already undergone great changes in its onward progress, and that it must and will undergo many more. For this reason, whatever tends to elucidate the history of the early Church is peculiarly valuable now. Mr. Westcott, among others, and beyond others, has done good service to the truth in this way. In his learned and suggestive '*History of the Canon of the New Testament*,' which he has lately abridged, with some additions on the Old Testament, in '*The Bible in the Church*,' we have a contribution, which can hardly be overrated, towards a solution of the great question of our day. By enabling us to realize the condition of the primitive Church, of its doctrines and discipline, he assists us much to answer, fairly and truly as it deserves, the momentous question, whether the faith has indeed been in a perpetual state of flux and change, as is pretended, since its commencement, inconstant and variable as the sand in its shifting phases, or whether we may safely trust our hopes to its rocklike stability, leaning on it fearlessly, as on that which has once for all been deposited with the saints in its absolute integrity.

It is rare to find laboriousness in research combined with the power of viewing a subject comprehensively and of drawing profound conclusions: rare, too, to find a tone of judicial calmness and sobriety in one whose sympathies are heartily enlisted. This is what makes a man at once historian and philosopher. Nor is there perhaps any subject which demands more imperatively all this patience, candour, and intuition than the early history of the Church. There the investigator has no common difficulties against him. There is so much to

provoke prejudice and partialities, and the supply of accessible materials is scanty. Cautious, exact, and deliberate, Mr. Westcott amasses his materials with the minute diligence of a German professor, while he uses them with a practical common sense, and an eye to proportion, in which German professors are often lamentably deficient. He is too dispassionate to allow the advocate to intrude into the seat of judgment. He guards himself scrupulously from all those hasty, plausible assumptions which detract so much from the value of recent writings on the subject, more highly coloured than his, but made of less solid stuff, and less deserving of reliance. There is nothing rhetorical in his pages, nothing of frothy declamation. They form a worthy continuation to the labours of Bull, Pearson, and Waterland. Probably they would be more attractive generally, if he were less sparing of embellishment. Many readers who might profit largely by his teaching, may probably be deterred by a style that is dry and 'closely-twisted together.' For their sake, if for no other reason, it may be worth while to reproduce as briefly and clearly as may be some of the impressions suggested by his book, with some legitimate inferences from it.

His main object is to trace the Canon of the New Testament from its origin: in other words, to ascertain from the evidence of history how the several books, which constitute the New Testament as we have it, came to be regarded as canonical, that is, of special authority in the Church. The result of his inquiries—and it is one which an unbiassed mind can hardly hesitate to accept—is, that, with some few exceptions, the books of the New Testament in its present form were recognised universally among Christians, orthodox and heretic alike, from the very first, as genuine<sup>1</sup> and authoritative. Though not formally expressed by the collective voice of the Church till the fourth century, this recognition is inferred, if not with certainty, yet with strong appearance of probability, from references extant in early writers, as a fact coeval with Christianity. At first, indeed, it was implicit and unavowed, because unquestioned. Gradually it became explicit, pronounced in set terms. The outlines of the Canon were shaped more and more precisely, as controversies arose, which had to be determined, on the subject. As to the 'disputed' books, the evidence is less unanimous, the verdict less decisive. Clearly we have here, in this traditionary acceptance of the same sacred Scriptures, a strong argument, so far as it goes, for the fixity of the faith from the beginning. The Canon grew; but its growth

---

<sup>1</sup> It is strange that a writer so learned and accurate as Mr. Westcott, should use 'authentic' for 'genuine.' See his 'Canon,' &c. *passim*.

was that of a plant retaining its original elements and structure—of a flower which, after all, is only the bud expanded. Or we may find a closer analogy in what takes place, when the eye by looking more attentively discovers features in the landscape, which were there all the time but unnoticed before. The whole question of canonicity was ignored at first, because a canon was unnecessary for the contemporaries of the Apostles. It remained dormant afterwards, so long as the Christian world was agreed on the subject. Only under the pressure of controversy it became necessary to draw the line of demarcation sharply and definitely between canonical books and uncanonical. Then the hitherto floating particles settled into permanent cohesion.

But in establishing this point, other collateral points of yet greater moment are brought to the surface. This very fact of the absence for some time of any authorized definition of Scripture, testifies to the existence of another stream parallel to that of Scripture, distinct but never divergent, ruling the doctrine and practice of the Church, the living stream of custom and tradition. A Canon was not wanted, while the Apostolic teaching was fresh in the recollection of the faithful. Appeal could be made, and was made, to the testimony of men still living, who had sat at the feet of the personal followers of the Lord. The truth was transmitted from the lips of saint to saint, of confessor to confessor. It was enshrined everywhere in the public liturgies of the Church. The very air was saturated with the tradition. The early writers are in the habit of quoting the sense rather than the very words of Scripture, because they quoted from memory, like a man preaching without a written sermon, not like the same man at his desk with his books at hand. Justin Martyr, for instance, refers in a general way to the 'Memoirs of the Apostles'—τὰ Ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων—that is, as abundant passages show, to records<sup>1</sup> received from the Apostles and their immediate followers—he does not give the reference to any particular Gospel or Epistle. The teaching of Christ and his Apostles was too deeply stereotyped on the mind of the Church for men to wrangle about texts. Faith rested securely then on that foundation, on which the Church is built, the word communicated by Him to His Apostles, and through them to the world at large.

We are apt not to realize adequately the closeness and living efficacy of the ties which bound the members of the Church into one body in those days. Its organization was compact though

<sup>1</sup> Other parts of the New Testament are perhaps included in this very vague designation; but is usually understood of the Gospels only.

extensive. Christians were scattered far and wide, sundered by differences of race and climate, yet united, not by any mere sentiment, but by real, actual communion. No doubt the gigantic network of iron which the Roman Empire had flung over its dependencies, compressing and welding into one massive system, though it could not fuse into thorough assimilation, elements so heterogeneous, served by the wisdom of Providence to make this intercommunion more practicable than it could have been otherwise. We, Englishmen of the nineteenth century, are so insulated from active sympathy with our fellow-Christians of the East and of the West, that we cannot easily understand the feeling of fellowship which pervaded the Church then. Not all the many facilities which science furnishes for intercourse and correspondence avail to bridge over this estrangement for us. We have resources, which the second century had not, in our press, our postal machinery, our means of transit. But we have not that essential unity of doctrine and habitude which they had. It flowed from causes quite irrespective of these things.

The framework of ecclesiastical discipline, though elaborated more and more as time went on, existed in outline from the first. Church-government was the same in outline then as now. The Church in each place might indeed wear some distinctive characteristics. But these were as nothing in comparison of the broad identifying stamp of Catholicity which was everywhere. Each community might cherish with especial reverence some portion, addressed in the first instance to itself, of the Sacred Writings. Each particular Version might assert its nationality by some minute traits. There might be a tendency towards this or that direction in schools, as of Antioch and Alexandria. But intercommunion connected and amalgamated all these idiosyncrasies. The Epistle treasured as in a sense the private property of one city was read aloud in the public services of other places also. A Christian changing his home, or dwelling for a time among strangers, carried letters of commendation from one bishop to another. The 'brethren'—and how vividly does that word portray the relation of Christians to one another then—were frequently sending alms and greetings to others far away, who were in need. The inevitable danger of error insinuating itself through the personal bias of one teacher, or of one school, was checked by the counter-tendencies of another. The part was sound because of the healthy action of the organic whole. The proportion of the Articles of the faith, which private predilections unrestrained tend to destroy, was preserved by that conflict of opposing forces, which results in the tacit consent of all. Hence the spirit, not of rigid uniformity, but of essential unity, which animates the ancient Creeds.

But we are sometimes told that the early Church was divided into two great sections or parties, headed respectively by S. Peter and S. Paul. These are represented as widely severed, and strongly opposed; each party holding only a fragment of the truth, and insisting on that exclusively with a narrow intolerance. Thus the doctrine of the early Church is spoken of as the result of a compromise gradually effected between them. Such a state of things is graphically depicted, and made the basis of grave inferences. But there is more of imagination than of fact in it. A closer attention to the early writers shows, that this struggle between the Jewish and Gentile schools is very much exaggerated, and that the Judaizers of whom we hear so much, were, in fact, in the position of persons half converted, rather than truly within the pale. When we turn to 'the first Greek Epistle which can be regarded as authentic,'<sup>1</sup> we meet at once with proofs of harmony and agreement. S. Clement was, if we may trust history, a follower of S. Peter. But his epistle bears palpable traces of the influence of S. Paul, not in its line of thought only, but in its very turns of expression. A more remarkable instance could hardly be desired of the great truth, that Christianity is not the result of a long series of contests, and compromises, and oscillations, but a code of doctrine and practice complete in the main from the very first. Particular persons then, as now, and as always, are apt to seize with avidity, and to dilate into a false prominence, one or another article of the faith. One great teacher was led to regard the faith chiefly from one point of view; another contemplated it in a different aspect. But are we, therefore, to assume that either of them denies all that he does not affirm, or that both aspects were not duly appreciated by the collective mind of the Church in their day? Even the heresies of earliest date seem to leap forth into the world, like Pallas from the head of Zeus, full-grown in stature and equipped for the fight. By their very presence on the field of battle they imply that there was a definite system there already, which they would not acquiesce in. The more closely we look, the more plainly we see, that the faith of the Christian Church is not the progressive growth of long years of controversy, but a thing given to men in all its fulness, and once for all, by a heavenly Teacher, to be expanded, indeed, and developed in its application to the outer world, but not to be re-shaped and re-modelled by man's ingenuity, as if it were his own invention. The first centuries of the Christian era are sometimes called the infancy of the Church. So in one sense they are. In another they are its maturity. For the older covenant was the discipline preparatory for manhood. Christ

---

<sup>1</sup> Westcott's 'Canon,' p. 29.

came 'in the fulness of time;' and what He came to communicate He gave without stint and without imperfection.

There is indeed a progress which ecclesiastical history unfolds in page after page. Each nation and each century in turn is made subservient to the workings of Providence. The Jew, stern and unyielding, and with a moral sense disciplined for the work, is the first to receive the new teaching, that through his retentive nature it may lay a hold on the world, which shall never be shaken off. Next, the supple Greek lends all his multifarious resources of thought and language to express, interpret, illustrate it. Then the Roman, the conqueror of the world, unconsciously obeys the behest of a higher power while ministering to the Church those excellences in which he is pre-eminent, of orderly obedience to law, of systematic policy and organization. The sturdy Teuton, again, brings with him the intense consciousness of individual responsibility. Here is progress. But it is the growth of a huge primæval tree, branching out freely on every side, while it is too firmly rooted in the earth to swerve from its centre. That legitimate development which keeps the analogies of the faith is gradual and insensible. Error announces itself to the world as something new. Athanasius and Augustine advance with one hand firmly grasping the past. Simon Magus publishes to the world his 'Great Announcement,' as if himself a new Avatar, or, at least, a prophet, if not something more.

But the early fathers, we hear it said, were not critical. That depends on what is meant by the word. In its specific sense it means the analysis, as from without, of a language, which lives only in the past. In this sense the early fathers were decidedly uncritical. But they had no need of this kind of criticism for their purpose. The subject with which they had to do was not enwrapt like a mummy in the cerecloths of a dead language. It was embodied in a form yet warm with the breath of life, instinct with motion and vitality. A man can dispense with the help of the microscope in things, with which he is practically conversant, and familiar by daily, hourly use. In this sense, it may be conceded at once that the early fathers, till the Alexandrine school, were not critical. The word has, however, a wider signification. The critical faculty in man is that which tries and verifies for itself what is presented to it by the senses or the understanding. A critical mind is one which can thus adjudicate clearly and well. Now, notwithstanding much that is said plausibly, but fallaciously, on this point, one age can be more critical than another only in those matters of which it has fuller and more accurate information. For those differences in moral character which make one man more pre-



capitate and inconsiderate than another, or which otherwise pervert and distort the judgment, are lost in the comparison of age with age. In this respect the average is much the same generally. If a man has his reasoning faculties in their normal state, and if these are uninterrupted in their working by moral hindrances, there is nothing more wanted than a competent knowledge of the facts to enable him to judge rightly and well. For the process of reasoning is the same in every person—in the peasant and in the philosopher—a mere form of syllogising, consciously or not—quicker or slower, according to constitution and training, but correct as a machine always, unless interfered with either by ignorance or by some bias thwarting its proper action. Now, their most prejudiced opponent will hardly say that the early fathers, unless blinded by the grossest fanaticism (which is easily disproved), were biassed by any sort of self-seeking towards doctrines which exposed them to so much persecution. Clearly, therefore, the difference in power of judging between them and the men of our self-styled more critical age must be, if anywhere, in point of knowledge—in knowledge, that is, of the particular subject under consideration. For it has been shown already that progress in physical science, and in its cognates, cannot affect the question. If, indeed, it engenders a habit of doubting, where doubts are unreasonable and out of place, it is so far prejudicial. It only remains, therefore, to ask, whether the Christians of the earliest centuries were sufficiently acquainted with the facts of their religion. They may have been very credulous, because very ignorant, on the subject of the Phœnix, or in their notions of geology or cosmogony. But what then? Our own Elizabethan writers appear ridiculous, if they are quoted on a subject about which the world in which they lived knew nothing. But, for all that, the men of that era, not only the exceptional men, like Bacon and Shakespeare, but the men of average ability, were as truly critical within the range of their experience, as just and wise, so far, in their conclusions, as the wisest of their posterity. So with the early fathers. Let it only be granted, as of course it must, that they had the ordinary power of reasoning from their premises, and that they were unbiassed, and it follows that they were as discriminating in the matters under their cognizance, as a modern professor in his sphere of geology or electricity. In questions of religion they speak of what they knew better than those, who are farther removed from the epoch of its revelation. Uncritical about other things, they were not uncritical nor incompetent in speaking of Christ and Christianity. There they speak as being eye-witnesses themselves, or as having learnt from those who were.

The great point to be borne in mind by those who appeal to the early Church, and defer to its decisions, is that the appeal must be made, not to any one writer, however eminent, not to any one Council, however nearly Œcumenical, but to the general consent of all. The terms that cancel each other are fairly eliminated from the equation. Just as in attempting to recover the correct text, we cannot trust unreservedly to any one manuscript or version as infallible, so in questions of doctrine, we look to a collation of evidence from various sources. The faith of the Church is not to be extracted from the pages of any one of its Doctors, however saintly or wise, nor from chapter and verse in the sacred books. Nor was it the result of any one great controversy. It is the accumulation of the treasures committed to the safe keeping of the Church; it is the solemn utterance of the voices of Christendom in its purest age, blended and harmonized together by the Holy Spirit, like the richly swelling chords of a large and complicated organ. The Lirinensian rule is a good one : *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Only it must be taken with the qualification which common sense requires. Literally taken it stultifies and destroys itself. The infallibility implied by the unanimous sentence of all Christians in all places, and throughout all time, is beyond the reach of man, and inconsistent with the probation of a being, who must prove his faith by trying all things and holding fast that which is good, and who has to contend, not solely against wrong-doing, but against errors in belief, which sooner or later end in what is practically wrong. Absolute infallibility is not to be had on this side the grave. But each ancient writer in turn contributes weighty testimony—and that testimony is more or less weighty according to his nearness to the Apostolic age—to some part of the truth. Each Council discharges its appointed task by affirming, more explicitly than before, some one of its many aspects. A sound judgment knows how to attach proportionate weight to the evidence which history brings before it. In studying the Canon of Scripture, a sensible man is in no haste either to accept or reject dogmatically such portions as have been ‘disputed,’ though not expunged, by the ages most competent to decide. In controversies of doctrine he cannot but feel less assured on those points, where an apparent collision of authorities calls upon him to pause and suspend his judgment. But as he does not expect either from the lips of Popes, or from the votes of Councils, or from the too confident promptings of his own conscience, an infallibility for which he has no right to crave, so he is content to remain in suspense even on much that he would fain know for a certainty, till the time shall come;

content if only light enough be shed on his way to guide him step by step onwards to the end.

Never was it more needful, than at the present time, to bear in mind this great truth, that 'As it was in the beginning,' is the motto of the Catholic Christianity, the watchword of the English Church. When questioned of our faith, our answer is this: 'We believe that which has been believed from the 'beginning.' Tried by this test, the pretensions of a spurious catholicity are detected and exposed. The word Catholic has become popular; it is bandied to and fro till it is in danger of lapsing into a mere sound and nothing more: it is even paraded, 'a strange device,' on the banners of transcendental neology, in a case diametrically opposite to its real meaning. Yet the idea, which the word represents, remains deeply, broadly true for ever. It is the consent, as the greatest sage of heathendom has taught us, not of the many, but of those most competent, most qualified to judge. Apply this principle to the questions belonging to the Christian faith. The consent, however general—nay, though only not universal—of any subsequent period, is simply valueless, unless it includes the consent of the Church in the apostolic and sub-apostolic age: for, as we have been endeavouring to show, the belief of the Church then is, on these points, the one thing most worthy of attention, most weighty in turning the scale. In the days of Athanasius, the many even within the Church were against, not with the truth. So it may be at any time, if once we relax our hold on the tradition of the Church from the beginning. The discordant echoes of controversy are only stilled and reconciled by an appeal to what has been. The imperious claims of Rome, on the one hand, and on the other, the preposterous assumptions of scepticism, can only be met in this manner. When once the divine mission of the Founder of Christianity has been established, then whatever article of belief can be traced, through the continuous testimony of the Church, up to that source, commands assent irresistibly. If this great principle of adherence to antiquity were more clearly recognised as the vital principle of the English Church, the strength of her position would be appreciated more generally.

At the present time many, who have hitherto been leaning unreasoningly on an arbitrary theory of mechanical inspiration, finding their confidence rudely shaken, and the prop on which they leaned failing them under a weight and a pressure which it was never intended to bear, are asking in utter bewilderment for support and guidance. They hear a Babel of voices round them, the din of controversies, and ask in alarm, how are English Churchmen to know what to believe, in the uncertainty which the late

judgment of the Privy Council appears to them to create and sanction. But these feelings of uncertainty and alarm cannot touch those whose standard of belief is not 'the Bible and the Bible alone,' but the historic teaching of the Church from the beginning. They, at all events, know what they believe, and why. Their faith ought to be proof against speculations and surmises which cannot reach it. Such questions, for instance, as were raised in the notorious 'Essays and Reviews' cannot disturb the mind of one whose belief is built up on that rock, which the divine Ruler of the Church in His infinite wisdom deposited as its sure foundation. Take the last of the seven essays; the most dangerous of the number, because, in its tendency, the most profoundly subversive of the very principles of revelation. Such a theory as is there propounded on the interpretation of the Scriptures, obviously ignores, from beginning to end, the existence of an historic tradition of the truth, external to these books: it proceeds on the assumption that every Christian is to take his Bible and find out for himself his religion from it. However plausible in one aspect it may be, this is simply like working a sum with less than half of its figures. It is a curious instance of the extent to which the leaven of Puritanism, with its abhorrence of authority and its presumptuous assertion of the individual conscience, has penetrated the English nation, that the panic occasioned by 'Essays and Reviews' should have been so general even in quarters where it was least to be expected. One is tempted to say,

'Hæc certamina tanta  
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescunt.'

Certainly the importance of the recent controversies which have been so recklessly provoked by Dr. Colenso and the seven essayists is very much diminished, as soon as we appeal from the letter of the Scriptures to the concurrent testimony of the Church Catholic in its purest age.

This great principle for which we are contending—that what the English Church has to do now, is to hold fast her existing formularies, as being the embodiment of primitive orthodoxy—is in danger of being overlooked in the excitement of the moment, and in the outcry which is raised for a new court of ecclesiastical appeal. We are not saying that the alarm is groundless. It is justified in some measure; not, indeed, by the mere fact of heretical notions being promulgated, for that is no new thing, but by the fact of their being promulgated by clergymen. Still, the alarm is disproportionate to the occasion. We are not defending the recent decision. But those who are panic-stricken by it, seem to forget that it was a natural consequence

of the slippery and evasive nature of the statements delated; and that writings which are so cautious not to jeopardize this responsibility of the writer, even while stirring up the gravest doubts and perplexities in others, could not easily have been made amenable to law in any court of justice. At all events, a bad decision, or even more than one bad decision, is not enough to condemn a tribunal, or to settle a question which ought to be entertained calmly and dispassionately on its own merits. Those who could not object to the same court, presided over by a Roundell Palmer or a Page Wood, must not be immoderate in their denunciations of it because there happens to be a Bethell on the woolsack. No possible or conceivable court could be guaranteed from fallibility. We are not defending the constitution of the present court as perfect. The presence on it of a removable and political and partisan judge, such as the Lord Chancellor must be, is its greatest defect. We only urge, that whatever court is most likely to keep closely to the formularies as they are, is best. Probably no sort of court is less in danger of being swayed by gusts of temporary excitement to any deviation in one direction or another from the letter of the formularies, than a court composed of English judges. They need the assistance of theologians to explain the force of theological terms, just as 'experts' are needed in certain cases, or interpreters are needed in any law-suit which concerns foreigners; but the ultimate decision is perhaps as safe in their hands as anywhere else. They may be predisposed by the habits and instincts of English jurisprudence, to take the restrictions imposed by the formularies in the widest sense permissible, and to give the accused the benefit of every doubt. But they are not likely, as a rule, to strain the formularies to meet a particular case, nor to pervert their sense under the bias of party-feeling. A court composed solely of ecclesiastics would be more likely to read the formularies not as they are, but as in its opinion they ought to be, as its members would wish to have them. If we look to other countries, we may see enough to make us pause before insisting on a change. Would the English clergy be willing to exchange their present position, with all its safeguards of law, for that of a Presbyterian minister, subject to the variable impulses of a General Assembly, or of a French priest, liable to be removed from his post at any moment by the irresponsible act of his bishop? Would the English laity be satisfied with any Court of Appeal which acted on any other principle than that of simply taking the formularies as they are, or which, avowedly or unconsciously, followed its own theories of orthodoxy, instead of keeping closely and strictly to the letter of the law? A purely spiritual Court of Appeal would be the first step

towards a new Prayer-book, and towards the disruption of Church and State in England. It is only those who regard the Christian faith as a thing to be recast every year, who need desire it. To reform the present Court of Appeal is one thing; and that it ought to be reformed there can be no doubt. To extemporize a new Court of Appeal is quite another thing.

But the cry is raised of 'Erastianism.' It would be Erastian to allow the civil power to make doctrine for the Church. But it is the business of the Court of Appeal not to make doctrine, but to take it as it finds it. The State has established the Church in England, as holding and teaching a certain definite belief, expressed in certain formularies, which have been framed by the spiritual and accepted by the temporal party to the compact. On these conditions the Church retains her national position; a vantage-ground for inculcating the truth not to be surrendered lightly, nor without overwhelming necessity. Both parties, therefore, have an interest and a voice in deciding whether or not those conditions have been violated in any instance, and whatever machinery is best adapted for ensuring a strict observance of these conditions without regard to anything else, is the best court of appeal.

The English Church may well be thankful to hold fast the inheritance which has providentially been transmitted to our day in our existing formularies. We cannot be too watchful against whatever threatens their stability. We enjoy in them the fruit of the labours of our forefathers in the Church Catholic. They have laboured, and we enter into their labours. Here is the vast difference between our own age and that of Athanasius or Augustine. By the dispensation of Providence, we of these latter days receive ready to our use, shaped and fashioned under many a fiery trial into its present clearness of definition, but essentially and substantially the same always, the time-honoured symbols of the ancient faith. The same Providence which watched over and matured the labours of our predecessors in the Christian Church, while they formed creed and liturgy, bids us to retain and preserve what we have received. 'We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works that God did in their days, and in the old time before them.' Our place in the history of the world, and of the Church, marks out some work for us. Even the heresies that we have to contend with are but the old errors disinterred and resuscitated; even against them our strength is in the past, without recourse to novelties. The recent dogma of the Roman Church on the Immaculate Conception is a warning against change in the guise of development. But it is no obstructive and unprogressive conservatism that we advocate. The Church of Christ is no petrification, no fossil



exhumed from bygone strata, and alien to our world : it is the tree, whose branches are ever spreading themselves more and more widely over the future, because its roots are deep in the past. There is much to be done in the adaptation of what is old to new requirements, in presenting ancient doctrine in the form most intelligible, most persuasive to modern habits of thought ; in applying immutable precepts to the ever-varying conditions of humanity ; in conforming the traditional framework of ecclesiastical organization to the needs of our rapidly-increasing population at home and in our colonies, in reclaiming the separatists who by causes of one kind or another have been estranged from the one true fold ; in restoring the intercommunion, too long unhappily suspended, of the several churches of the East and of the West, in order that all may unite against the aggressions of infidelity. Here is work enough, and more than enough, to be done ; and in this, rather than in adding supererogatory Articles to our Creed, in attempting to define what has providentially been left undefined, we may trust that the Great Head of the Church, now as ever, will bless our exertions with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But our first care must be, not to lose what has been so hardly won for us. In our convocation, in our ruridecanal synods, in our several spheres of personal influence, let English churchmen unite uncompromisingly to preserve their Prayer-book intact, in church and in school. Without claiming for that book an impeccability which cannot be found on this side the grave, it is not too much to say, that it providentially enshrines the teaching of the primitive church, in terms which assert the truth firmly and clearly in all its essentials, and which, at the same time, allows a wise and legitimate latitude for those inevitable diversities of thought and sentiment which distinguish one man from another, and mark each as having an individual and responsible existence. So long as we keep our Prayer-book intact, there is no cause, we will not say for despondency, but even for anxiety as to the future of the Church of England.

---

ART. VI.—*Nicolai Sanderi, de origine ac progressu Schismatis Anglicani Libri Tres. Quibus historia continetur maxime Ecclesiasticis annorum circiter sexaginta, lectu dignissima; nimirum, ab anno 21. regni HENRICI octavi, quo primum cogitare cœpit de repudiandâ legitimâ uxore serenissimâ CATHARINÂ usque ad hunc vigesimum octavum ELIZABETHÆ, quæ ultima est ejusdem Henrici soboles. Aucti per EDOUARDUM RISHTONUM, et impressi primum in Germaniâ, nunc iterum locupletius et castigatius editi. Cujusque libri argumenta, pagella versa monstrabit. Cum privilegio, et Licentia Superiorum. Romæ: Typis Bartholomæi Bonfadini, in Viâ Pellegrini. MDLXXXVI.*

PROBABLY few of our readers are acquainted with the name of Nicholas Sanders, and still fewer will be found who have read his once famous work on the Anglican schism; yet he was, according to Wood, the most noted defender of the Roman Catholic cause in his time. Indeed, the same obscurity attaches to the names of nearly all those who adhered to the old form of religion in Queen Elizabeth's time, as well as to that numerous body of individuals who, from time to time during that reign, quitted the English for the Roman communion. Churchmen of this day can have little sympathy with their predecessors of the latter half of the sixteenth century, when Puritanism was rampant, and the idea of Catholicism almost obliterated from the face of the English Church. It must have been indeed a dreary time when the primacy was occupied in succession by Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, and when the other sees were filled by names of inferior note, which are scarcely even remembered in the present day. Perhaps Sandys and Aylmer may be considered familiar names, the one having had the luck to find a biographer in Strype, and the other figuring as one of the worthies of the Parker Society; but as for any other names of churchmen, the pages of Godwin and Le Neve would be searched in vain to discover any single bishop or dignitary of the Church who rose to any importance, either political or ecclesiastical. And if people are disposed to quarrel with the appointments that are now made to the episcopal bench, they have only to look back to the times of Elizabeth to see that the holders of the sees in those days were, in almost every case, vastly inferior to the occupants of them at the present day. We venture to say, that if we were to

enumerate the bishops that in succession held the suffragan sees in the southern or the northern province, so little are they known, that scarcely any reader would be able to judge, in any degree, of the correctness of our enumeration. Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, is the single exception—if, indeed, he is to be excepted. He has certainly gained for himself a notoriety; yet even he, in intellectual power, could scarcely be pronounced equal to the average Anglican bishop of the present half of the nineteenth century. There was simply no such thing as learning in the Church of England. Puritanism had the reins, and Puritanism and learning are inconsistent: scholarship is too refined for it, general knowledge too comprehensive, theology too weighty, poetry too divine. It was no wonder if learning took refuge in the Roman communion, and if Roman controversialists got the best of every argument, when there were neither men nor weapons to fight them with. It requires but a slight glance even at such a book as Fulke's 'Defence of the Translation of the Bible' to see that his opponent had, on many points, much the best of the argument, and succeeded in showing that the Protestant version had, in many places, been garbled to suit the received notions of Puritanism. It was of importance, of course, for those who disparaged good works to translate *ἀδικος* 'unrighteous,' instead of 'unjust,' when the latter word would have suggested that good works had a value in the eyes of God. And it was a great help to the Calvinistic theory to find the expression 'such as should be saved' used for a participle which excludes all idea of time but the present.

Well, as we have said, learning went to Rome, and it would be an instructive piece of information, if we could ascertain how many gifted and learned sons of the Church of England were, during that reign and in spite of the dangers of the avowal, converted to Romanism.

Nicholas Sanders, the author of the work whose title is placed at the head of this article, was not of the number of converts, or perverts, as they are now, and as they were then called, according to the sympathies of the speaker. He was a fellow of New College, Oxford, during nearly the whole of the reign of Edward and Mary; and, as Antony Wood quaintly expresses it, 'religion putting on another face in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth, he left England about 1560, and, going to Rome, was made priest and doctor of divinity.' He afterwards attended Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius at the Council of Trent. After this he was sent as nuncio from Gregory XIII. to Ireland, with the view of encouraging the Irish to take up arms against Queen Elizabeth; but, upon the failure of the rebellion, he was forced to hide himself, and somewhere about

the year 1581 he was starved to death. There is, however, another account of his death given by one of his own persuasion, of which Wood quietly observes, that therefore it may not be believed by many. It is to the effect that, before the end of the war, he died of the flux; that having a presentiment of death, though others thought he would live, he sent for the Bishop of Killaloe, and received extreme unction at his hands the same day, and was buried in the evening of the next. He was the author of a great many controversial works, directed against Jewel and others; but that which is best known is his Latin work, '*De origine ac progressu Schismatis Anglicani*.'

We do not now concern ourselves either with the author himself or with any of his other publications. We wish to draw attention to a book which, whatever may be its merits or demerits, has not for two hundred years met with as much notice as it deserves, regarded simply in the light of an original authority nearly contemporary with the events it details. It was published in the first instance at Cologne, in 1585, just four years after the author's death, and was reprinted in the following year, in a small octavo volume, at Rome, with additions and alterations by the editor, Edward Rishton. It had evidently a great success, for there are four other editions, one published two years afterwards at Ingolstadt, in 1588, and the other three at Cologne, in 1590, 1610, and 1628 respectively. It was twice translated into French, once soon after its original publication, and again, in 1676, by Maucroix. It was to the appearance of this French publication, at the critical juncture when there were very general fears entertained that the heir presumptive to the crown might attempt to reduce the nation again to the Roman obedience, that we owe the publication of the celebrated history of the Reformation by Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury. We have taken it for granted that few of our readers will know much about this author; but no one can have read Burnet's first two volumes through without finding out that Sanders is the object of his special abhorrence. At the end of each volume several pages are devoted to the exposing of the mistakes made by Sanders. These are all noticed *seriatim*. The author begins his paragraphs with the words 'He says,' &c. quoting the page of the volume to which he refers, and then proceeds to contradict or refute, as it may happen to be, the assertions of his antagonist.

Burnet classes his opponent's errors under two heads: first, faults of ignorance, which disparage and discredit the work, as showing that the author had no true information of our affairs; secondly, errors of a higher guilt, being designed forgeries to

serve partial ends; not only being without any authority, but manifestly contrary to truth and to such records as are yet preserved. It is remarkable that, in speaking of Sanders' mistakes thus in the general, Burnet should, in the very same sentence, himself have fallen into an error which he has several times repeated in his history, viz. 'that they took care, in 'Queen Mary's reign, by destroying the records, to condemn 'posterity to ignorance in these matters.' Now here is, first, an error of fact, and secondly, an imputation of a motive which could have had no existence, because the fact for which it is intended to account is not true. It is impossible to accuse Burnet here of wilful misrepresentation, for he has done all that was possible to show that his description was untrue. He has actually printed the commission to Bonner 'to raze the records,' as he words it. Unfortunately, the commission contains not a word about razing or destroying, but manifestly was issued for the preservation of such records as were notoriously badly kept in the days of Mary's predecessor. But it is impossible to defend Burnet's honesty in the matter without condemning him of the grossest carelessness. We quote this example here as an instance in point to show that Burnet was guilty of at least one of the faults he is so vehement in condemning in Sanders.

We have no intention of following Burnet through his analysis of Sanders' mistakes. We neither possess the historical knowledge which would suffice in every case to adjust the differences between them, nor if we had it in our power to do so, could the task be accomplished in less space than an ordinary sized octavo volume. We shall content ourselves with saying that there are, at least, as many errors in Burnet as in Sanders, and that the view which pervades the Roman Catholic writer appears to us in many instances nearer to the truth of history than that theory upon which the English bishop built his account of the transactions of the period. In the course of our description of Sanders' volume, we shall quote some of the passages which have been extracted and commented on by Burnet. It will be seen that Sanders is sometimes wrong, and sometimes Burnet, but that, for the most part, the assertions of the earlier writer which are attacked by the later are slight matters which do not much affect the main narrative; whilst there are many things which, though no evidence is brought for them, have certainly not been disproved by Burnet or any subsequent historian. One instance shall be given in point before we commence our account of Sanders' work.

Burnet accuses him of saying that 'Wolsey was first Bishop of Lincoln, then of Durham, after that of Winchester, and 'last of all Archbishop of York; after that he was made

'chancellor, then cardinal and legate.' Burnet's reply to this is as follows:—'The order of these preferments is quite reversed: for Wolsey, soon after he was made Bishop of Lincoln, upon Cardinal Bambridge's death, was not only promoted to the see of York, but advanced to be a cardinal in the seventh year of the king's reign, and some months after that he was made lord chancellor, and seven years after that he got the bishopric of Durham which, six years after he exchanged for Winchester. He had heard, perhaps, that he enjoyed all these preferments, but knowing nothing of our affairs beyond hearsay, he resolved to make him rise as poets order their heroes, by degrees, and therefore ranks his advancement, not according to truth, but in the method he liked best himself.'

Now Burnet's account of these preferments is substantially correct, though he too has omitted to notice that Wolsey held the see of Bath and Wells for four years with the archiepiscopal see of York. Yet after all, the blunder, if Sanders had been guilty of it, is of small consequence, inasmuch as the writer was only professing to enumerate the preferments, and not going to found any argument upon the different periods at which Wolsey attained them respectively. But now, upon turning to Sanders, it appears that he does not state the matter at all in the way Burnet represents it. Sanders' expression is, as far as it goes, strictly correct, that Wolsey enjoyed in succession the bishoprics of Lincoln, Durham, and Winchester, and that he even held the last most wealthy see *in commendam* with the archbishopric of York. He adds that he was also a cardinal and Legate de Latere, and enjoyed pensions from the Emperor and the French king, to say nothing of the revenues of several abbeys, and the unbounded influence he exerted over the mind of the English king.

Now here is no wilful misrepresentation on Burnet's part, for it was open to any reader to refer to Sanders and expose it as we have done. It is simply an instance of the marvellous inaccuracy of mind in the writer of the 'History of the Reformation.' The editor of the new edition recently published at Oxford has taken no notice of the dispute between Sanders and Burnet. It would have been too difficult to draw the line between facts and opinions, and, as the instance before us shows, would have involved notes and comments to an extent beyond what is contemplated in an edition of an author's work. We, of course, are not fettered in the same way as an editor, and have no scruple in exposing any errors that Burnet may have fallen into in his epitome of Sanders' mistakes. And now we proceed with our account of the book.

The work is divided into three books: the first details the



cause and the origin of the schism in the reign of Henry VIII., that is, from the beginning and progress of the matter to the death of that king; the second embraces the two succeeding reigns of Edward and Mary, describing what the author calls 'the progress of the schism and the commencement of the Zuinglian heresy under Edward, with the restoration of the Catholic religion and the reconciliation of the kingdom under Mary;' whilst the third is entitled 'The second abrogation of the Catholic religion, and the introduction of the Calvinistic heresy, by Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn.' We propose to deal only with the first of these three parts in this paper, reserving the others for a future opportunity.

The idea which occupied Sanders' mind whilst he was writing the first book was plainly that of retribution. And it certainly is most remarkable how Henry VIII. was punished for what he did, by the very means by which he undertook to compass his wicked purposes; how he was, as it were, perpetually made to eat his own words, to go counter to what he had himself established, and how the warnings that came upon him were such as bore a striking resemblance to the circumstances under which his sins had been committed. We will give the reader an abridged description of Sanders' work; and, without committing ourselves to an exact agreement with the view which pervades it, we shall notice, as we touch upon successive points, the facts which appear inconclusively proved, as well as those which are either improbable in themselves or disproved by records. The view is boldly put out in the preface; and it is this, that for one cause alone Henry was induced to sever that connexion between England and the Roman communion, which had existed for more than 800 years. That cause was the marriage with Anne Boleyn. Arthur Prince of Wales and Catharine of Arragon had been married when the former was only just fifteen years of age, on the 15th of November, 1501. Prince Arthur died in April, 1502, leaving his virgin widow to deplore his loss, and during the following year a dispensation was obtained from Pope Julius II. for the marriage of Catharine with his younger brother, afterwards Henry VIII. The allegation on which the dispensation was founded was, the preservation of peace between the two countries. After twenty years' cohabitation, the king procured a divorce on the plea of conscience, that the marriage with a brother's widow was incestuous, and could not be dispensed with by the pope. The real reason, however, was that he might place Anne Boleyn in her place, in spite of her being so much more closely bound to him by the ties of affinity. Anne was the sister of one of the king's mistresses, viz. Mary Boleyn, an elder daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn, and the daughter

of another, viz. Lady Boleyn, the wife of Sir Thomas. This is Sanders' allegation; and he goes on to hint that there were, moreover, some indications that Anne was the offspring of the illicit intercourse of Henry with this lady. This was the woman, to compass a marriage with whom Henry was induced to break with the Roman Church, not however joining the sect of the Lutherans or the Zuinglians, nor pretending to adopt any more ancient communion, but erecting a new establishment, of which he denominated himself the supreme head upon earth. Anne had been guilty of prostitution before her marriage, had committed incest with her brother after her marriage, had always been addicted to the Lutheran heresy, and at length was executed by Henry, her own supposed father, Sir Thomas, sitting as one of her judges when she was condemned. This was the beginning of the modern form of religion in England. But the form of faith set up by Henry was entirely supplanted, and a new religion set up in its stead, by his children Edward and Elizabeth.

Now, as regards these assertions of Sanders, some of them are altogether incapable of proof. There is no proof remaining that Henry had any illicit intercourse with Lady Boleyn, but certainly the insinuation of Anne Boleyn's being his own daughter is capable of disproof. The connexion of Henry with Mary Boleyn is certain, being evidenced by a great variety of proof; and the view that Henry was influenced by the lady's charms, and not by conscientious scruples, to displace and divorce his lawful wife, will commend itself to any person who will take the trouble to read the falsehoods and contradictions on this subject which appear in his own speeches and letters and those of Wolsey. Sanders was eager to make out the worst case, and, like Burnet, greedily grasped at any hearsay intelligence which made for his point, without minutely sifting its accuracy. Anne Boleyn was born, according to various accounts, in 1501 or 1507. Now either of these dates precludes the possibility of her being Henry VIII's child. However, in Sanders' defence it may be observed that he only speaks of it as a rumour, and, as against Burnet, it may be urged that he gives no evidence of a fact which he boldly asserts, that Anne Boleyn was born in 1507. That she was born much earlier is nearly certain, from the fact that she was one of the ladies who accompanied the princess Mary to the court of France, on the occasion of her ill-starred marriage with Louis XIII. She will be found mentioned amongst the attendants as *Mademoiselle de Boullan*, in October, 1514. Now it would be absurd to suppose she was then only seven years old. It is not at all likely she would be less than thirteen or fourteen years of age, for all accounts agree

in representing her as being one of the party who went to France at this time. We are, therefore, somewhat surprised to find in Mr. Brewer's index she is called Mary, by the mistake of one sister for the other. The description given of Anne's person by Sanders is borne out by other accounts. He was far from wishing to detract from her beauty, as Burnet misrepresents him, for he speaks of her as beautiful and attractive; and when he mentions the bad complexion, the slightly projecting tooth, the incipient sixth finger on the left hand, and the slight deformity under her chin, which induced her, and other court ladies following her example, to wear high dresses instead of low, he mentions facts which are quite borne out by other descriptions of her. In fact the *animus* of his account is plainly to contrast the beauties of her person with the depravity of her mind, which was full, he says, of pride, envy, luxury, and ambition. The stories with which he continues his account, about her behaviour at the French court, and her intimacy with Wyatt and others, are, in all probability, false. At least no evidence for their truth is produced, and it is certain that Henry believed her to be of pure life when he first made his advances to her, and was repulsed in a manner which was evidently peremptory and meant to be final.

We proceed with the details of the history, following our author. Henry, after the death of his father, during whose lifetime he had been made to protest that he would not marry Catharine, married her at the age of eighteen, on the 3d of June, 1509, and they were both crowned on the following 24th of June, the festival of S. John Baptist. By her he had three sons and two daughters. The eldest son, who was called Henry, died nine months afterwards, and only one child, the Princess Mary, born 18th February, 1516, survived her parents. So far was the marriage from being called in question, that the legitimacy of the princess was never disputed, and she was betrothed to the dauphin, October 8th, 1518, at Greenwich. The queen lived in the most exemplary manner, whilst Henry was indulging in all kinds of debaucheries, keeping several mistresses at one time. By one of them he had a son whom he created Duke of Richmond. Wolsey had made use of the Emperor so long as he thought by his means he could in any way secure the succession to the popedom. But, after two disappointments, he turned round upon Charles, and with the view of annoying and thwarting him, suggested to the king, through Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, his confessor, the doubts about the legality of his marriage. Wolsey suggested, as the successor to the queen, Margaret, Duchess of Alençon. The king examined the matter for himself, and finding it hopeless, would have given up the prosecution

of the divorce, if it had not been that he could not gain possession of Anne Boleyn without it. Wolsey was determined moreover to keep the matter before his eyes.

It happened that there was a French embassy at London in the spring of 1527, for the arrangement of a marriage between the Princess Mary and the Duke of Orleans, second son of Francis; and the king suggested to Wolsey to insinuate to the Bishop of Tarbes, one of the ambassadors, that there was a doubt which had lately sprung up as regards the legality of the marriage of the king and queen of England, and that there was a great probability if this marriage could be set aside, that Henry would marry the French king's sister. The author proceeds to give the speech made by the Bishop of Tarbes to the king, urging him to take steps for a divorce, because, in the judgment of all learned men, the marriage with a brother's widow was contrary to God's law, and recommending him to marry the French king's sister, as being the best means of cementing the friendship between the two monarchs, and the perpetual alliance of the kingdoms. Upon this Wolsey took advantage of the difficulties in which the pope was involved, to recommend the king to assist the pope, and so secure his favour for giving a favourable judgment in the matter of the divorce. Accordingly Wolsey is sent ambassador to France, with instructions, among other things, to further the matter of the divorce and the contract with the Duchess of Alençon, but when at Calais he receives another set of instructions, viz. to say nothing about the duchess, because Henry had in the meantime made up his mind to marry Anne Boleyn. Wolsey, thus disappointed, for he had hoped that Anne Boleyn would have followed in the footsteps of her sister Mary, scarcely knew how to proceed. Anne, meanwhile, though allowing Henry every other degree of familiarity, steadily refused to become his mistress. What was going on soon reached the ears of the French court, and the talk of the day was about the intention of the king of England to marry the French king's mule. Upon this, Sir Thomas Boleyn becoming alarmed, returned home in haste to explain how matters stood as regarded the paternity of Anne Boleyn, but the king told him to hold his tongue, for he was determined to marry the girl whosoever child she might be.

The story went that Sir Thomas Boleyn had brought over with him the portrait of the Duchess of Alençon for Henry's inspection, and this was made the pretext of his hurried return. In order to deter the king from his purpose, Sir Thomas Wyat informed him that he had himself had an intrigue with Anne Boleyn, but the king professed entire disbelief of the story, and pursued his end as eagerly as ever.

Wolsey, before his return, had sent the protonotary, Gambara, to Rome to ask the pope to make him his vicar-general for France, Germany, and England, till Clement should be set at liberty. Immediately after his return, Wolsey is obliged to dissemble his disappointment, and to pretend to fall in with the king's plan for marrying Anne Boleyn. And he gives them both a great entertainment at his archiepiscopal residence. Meanwhile books are written, *pro* and *con.*, and upon consideration of them, several bishops gave it as their judgment that there was just cause for scruple. And Henry in his perplexity sent for Sir Thomas More, who gave his opinion against the king.

About this time Mary Boleyn went to the queen and consoled her about the marriage, alleging that it was impossible it could take place, because, by her own illicit connexion with Henry, he had contracted an affinity with Anne which would prevent any such marriage from legally taking effect. The king, however, was determined to have Anne Boleyn for his wife, and conceived great hopes of procuring a divorce, as Clement VII. seemed willing to do all he could to assist him. The author adds, that if Clement had not been Pope of Rome, and as such, saved by the prayers of Christ from doing it, he would have granted the king's request. Wolsey's hope, meanwhile, was that the king might yet be diverted from the marriage with Anne Boleyn, and be induced to marry the French king's sister, if the divorce should be accomplished. Moreover, he was racked with fears that if the pope should not grant it, the king would manage it in some other way, and withdraw the allegiance of the nation from the Holy See. Accordingly, Bryan and Gardiner, the latter a confidential friend of Wolsey's, and the former a profligate, who was usually termed the vicar of hell, were sent to the pope, who had escaped from prison and was then lodged at Orvieto, to obtain the divorce. They asked for a commission to Wolsey and Campeggio to determine the cause in England, and offered as a bribe 4,000 foot soldiers for the defence of Clement against the Imperialists.

The pope referred the matter to the cardinals, who unanimously declared that the marriage was good, the Levitical law being of necessity to be interpreted so as not to be repugnant to the subsequent law of Deuteronomy, about the marriage of a man with his brother's wife, the brother having died childless, for it was but natural that the earlier of these laws should be interpreted by the later. Upon this Gardiner shifted his ground, and alleged that though this was so, the dispensation of Julius for the marriage was null and void on other grounds, and expressed his surprise that what was not denied to private individuals, was withheld from the king of England, viz. a fair

trial of the case. The pope replied that he would do all that was in his power, but that consideration of justice was the first, and the peace of the Church the next, point to be attended to. After consulting the cardinals again, and hearing the allegations of some of them—that Henry had deserved much at their hands, and that the queen was quite prepared to take the vows and enter a religious house, if the cause should be decided against her—that there could be no harm in allowing a trial in England, which the pope could at any moment revoke and take the decision upon himself, Clement consented to commit the cause to Campeggio and Wolsey. Meanwhile, the queen gave the Emperor intelligence of what was going on, and requested the pope not to allow the cause to be tried in England, where the king's will was omnipotent.

Campeggio had departed before the Emperor's ambassador had complained to the pope of his hearing the allegations of ambassadors secretly sent out from the king without the queen's knowledge, and reminded him that all the better class of people in England were on the queen's side, and only those who hoped for court favour on the king's. Accordingly, Clement sent four messengers post-haste after Campeggio, ordering him to delay his journey as much as possible, and after his arrival to prolong the trial; to endeavour to persuade the queen to 'enter religion,' and upon no account to pronounce finally for the divorce. '*Hoc summum et maximum sit tibi mandatum.*'

Campeggio arrived in London, Oct. 7, 1528, and finding how matters stood, informed the pope that Wolsey was entirely bent on the divorce, and asked for instructions how to act. The pope delayed the matter as much as he could, and the king, finding that common report was against him, on the 8th of November assembled the peers and others together, and explained to them that he was only actuated by scruples of conscience. Sanders here gives very briefly a true version of the speech at Bridewell, which is narrated by Hall, in which Henry observes that if he had to marry again there was no one in the world he would choose in preference to Catharine, supposing the marriage could be established as lawful. Sanders perfectly knew the words he used, but could not have had an opportunity of comparing them with the letter written nineteen years before to the father of Catharine, when, having married the princess for her dowry, he adds that he should still, if free, choose her in preference to all the world. But kings' speeches and letters will not bear a minute scrutiny.

Wolsey prevailed upon the king to avoid the scandal of Anne Boleyn's constant association with himself on all public



occasions, and to send her home to her father during the Lent of 1529. She was so indignant at this dismissal that afterwards she could hardly be prevailed upon to return to court, and when, at the instigation of her father, she did return, she vowed vengeance.

And now the king determined to show that Pope Julius' dispensation was null and void; so new instructions were issued to Gardiner and Bryan, to bribe the cardinals, and to persuade the pope to pronounce upon the invalidity of the bull, and to grant a dispensation for the marriage of Mary with the Duke of Richmond. Sanders for this refers to the pope's letters to Campeggio. He quotes Cardinal Pole also for his assertion that Henry had himself written to the pope, acknowledging the connexion with Mary Boleyn, and asking for a dispensation to marry her sister Anne. As far as regards the bull of Pope Julius II., Clement said he would send to the Emperor for the original, and the ambassadors pressed the pope to declare it null and void, in case the Emperor should not transmit it within two months.

Henry, finding he could gain nothing from the pope, gave leave to the legates to try the cause, May 28, 1529. (This is a mistake for May 30.) On that day the king and queen were summoned, and Catharine appealed to the pope, and on the next day claimed the right of appeal—(1) because the place was suspect; (2) because the judges were suspect as being the king's subjects. The queen appealed also in person to the king, who, apparently with great kindness, condescended to grant her request. When she had retired, however, the king pressed the legates to decide the cause. And now the case was argued on both sides. The king's counsel enumerated all the objections that could be alleged against the bull of dispensation, as well as the protest that Henry, at his father's instigation, had made in 1505, that he would not marry the princess. Also, notwithstanding the queen's appeal, her proctors argued against all these allegations, and especially pressed the point of the bull pronouncing the dispensation upon the doubtfulness of the consummation of the previous marriage.

The next point discussed was the fact of the consummation: and here the queen's counsel rested the case chiefly on the ground that the queen had publicly professed her virginity both before and in court, and that Henry had not denied it. Sanders did not know, what is plain enough from Wolsey's correspondence, that he too was aware the state of the case was as the queen represented it. Nor had he seen the letter which appears in the Simancas Records, stating that though the dispensation was obtained for the case of a consummated marriage, in order that

no difficulty might hereafter be raised, yet that the whole English world was aware that Catharine had been left a virgin widow. Sanders, however, adds, what there is no evidence produced for, that Henry VII. had taken care that a grave matron should occupy the same room with the bridal couple, and that this was alleged by the queen's counsel at the trial. The counsel were Warham, Tunstall, West, Clark, Fisher, and Standish, all bishops, and four theologians named Abel, Fetherston, Powell, and Ridley. The last of these, he says, protested against the unfairness of not exacting an oath of the king's advocates, that they would do and say nothing contrary to the laws of God and the Church. The king urged for sentence to be pronounced, and Campeggio protested against the indecency of haste in so important a matter. Campeggio prolonged the case to near the end of July, and then pleaded the Roman custom for putting off the sittings till October. The king sent the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, on July 30, to order the legates to come to a decision. Campeggio declined, and Suffolk struck his hand on the table, declaring, with an oath, that never had cardinal or legate brought any good to England.

But Clement had already signified his advocacy of the cause (Herbert says in a letter to Wolsey of July 19), and the fact was notified to the king by the queen through Sir Thomas More. Soon afterwards Campeggio was recalled, and then the king turned upon Wolsey; and upon Campeggio leaving the country on the 7th of September, 1529, he had the baggage of the legates searched to see if he could find any letters which might serve to incriminate Wolsey. None, however, were found; and here again Sanders gives the true version of the facts, but did not know that the real reason for searching Campeggio's luggage was the desire to recover some love-letters from Henry to Anne Boleyn, which it was supposed had found their way there, and which, whether they were there or not, were soon afterwards at Rome, where they are preserved to this day. From this hour the fortunes of Wolsey rapidly fell; he was first deprived of the Great Seal, which was given to Sir Thomas More; and then of the bishopric of Winchester, which was subsequently offered to Gardiner.

And now the king sent Cranmer and others to manage his cause at Rome, and sent round to gather the opinions of the Universities of Germany and France, which he obtained in favour of the divorce by bribery. The author quotes several authorities for the fact of the bribery, and amongst others the Protestant historian Sleidan. The fact, we need hardly say, is abundantly confirmed by state papers, both pub-

lished and unpublished. When Mr. Brewer reaches the years 1529 and 1530, there will be evidence of this which will satisfy the most incredulous reader. Amongst the rest, the king tried to gain Reginald Pole to his side; but Pole, after considering the matter, resolutely refused.

As regards what was written on the subject, the author proceeds to enumerate several works on the queen's side, and mentions that there was still extant a letter of Melancthon's, advising the king to continue Catharine as his wife, and take Anne Boleyn as his concubine. The king himself went beyond this, and proposed to the pope that he should be allowed to have two wives at once. This again is a piece of history which recently published state papers fully confirm.

In the September following the king forbade all his subjects to sue in the court of Rome, and on November 28th, Wolsey's death took place. The author concludes his remarks about him with the words, 'He received in this world the penalty due to his pride and flattery, and that, as we may hope, to save him from everlasting punishment.' From this time forward the course of events seemed to show that God had given up Henry to his own imaginations. The death of Warham left the primacy open for Cranmer, who is recommended by Sir Thomas Boleyn and his daughter, as one who is well affected to the divorce, and who will not scruple to gratify the king in all things. The condition of his elevation was, that he should pronounce for the divorce in spite of whatever sentence the pope should give.

The chief difficulty in his way was that he had to swear canonical obedience to the pope, and this was removed by a protest made before a notary beforehand, that he did not mean by taking the oath to do anything to the injury of the king. Sanders adds of Cranmer, that he secretly carried about with him a German woman, whom he afterwards married in Edward VI.'s reign, and that he never in any single instance thwarted the king's inclinations.

Just at this time Henry crossed the sea, with Anne Boleyn in his train, to have an interview with Francis, in order to engage him in a war with the Emperor. It was his intention also to incense the French king against the pope, and to marry Anne Boleyn at once. Circumstances having prevented this, he returned home, and first brought the whole clergy under the sentence of *præmunire*. Soon after this followed the adoption of the title of Supreme Head of the Church, and the independence of the Church of England began to be proclaimed to cover the king's repudiation of his lawful wife. Sir Thomas More, seeing what was coming, resigned the Great Seal, which

was given to Audley, an indigent person, for whose support the revenues of a monastery and a parish church were confiscated.

Clement, hearing how matters were going, wrote to Henry, to warn him to do nothing prejudicial to his first marriage, and afterwards issued a breve, with penalties annexed, in case he should do anything whilst the cause was pending. But the king, finding nothing was to be hoped for from the pope, and knowing that Cranmer was so entirely in his power that he could get him to pronounce the marriage null and void at any time, first raised Anne to the rank of Marchioness of Pembroke, September 1st, 1532, and on the 15th of October married her. The latter date is one of the very few wrong dates in Sanders. All historians have differed as to the day, and it has only been settled by recent state papers, that the marriage did not really take place till January 25th, 1533. Rowland Lee, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, was induced to perform the ceremony in secret, on the false information given him by the king that the pope had at length pronounced sentence in his favour.

And now Catharine was banished from the court to the little town of Kimbolton in Bedfordshire, where she lived with a few attendants, entirely devoting herself to prayer and religious exercises. Meanwhile the king managed all things by a triumvirate, consisting of the Chancellor Audley, the Archbishop Cranmer, and Thomas Cromwell, whom he made his vicar-general. Heresy began to flourish, and books were published (amongst others the celebrated 'Supplication of the Beggars') ridiculing the clergy of all ranks, regular and secular. This book was answered by Sir Thomas More in his 'Supplication of the Souls in Purgatory.' And now the oath of supremacy was invented by Cromwell and Anne Boleyn, who, wishing to get rid of Fisher as being her chief opponent, first attempted to poison him through his cook, and then attempted to destroy him by means of the oath of supremacy. Fisher, however, in a weak moment, undertook for himself and others to take the oath (*quantum per Christi legem licet*) upon the king's assuring him that he only wished to try the allegiance of his clergy and other subjects. This, however, was afterwards a subject of great regret to Fisher, who often declared that it was his province as a bishop not to have used vague expressions, but to have declared to his people what was, and what was not, allowed by the law of Christ. And now Cranmer was called upon to pronounce the sentence of divorce, which he did at Dunstable, whither Catharine was summoned in vain for a fortnight, the archbishop having first gone through the farce of warning Henry, by letter, against cohabitation with his deceased brother's wife.

Anne Boleyn was publicly recognised April 12th, 1533, on the

day before Easter-Sunday, and crowned June 2d. Again Sanders is correct in his first date, though wrong by a single day in the second; for she was crowned on Whit-Sunday, June 1st. This, however, is no doubt a mere misprint, for which the editor is responsible. The definitive sentence of the pope followed in a short time. This is one of the original documents furnished by Sanders, and which our English historians have, for the most part, not quoted. It was issued in August, but the effect of it was suspended till the 1st of October, to give the king time to retract. Nothing, however, was further from Henry's intentions. He went on, as Sanders enumerates them, adding one wickedness to another; casting into prison, and ordering the execution of such ecclesiastics as had opposed his project. On the 7th of September, Elizabeth was born. On the 21st of May of the following year seven martyrs were executed about the matter of Elizabeth Barton, a nun who had predicted that Mary would be queen of England after her father. On the very same day the oath was tendered by Cranmer, Audley, and Cromwell, that Elizabeth was the true heiress of the Crown, and the talking against this oath was the cause of 200 persons being imprisoned. A Parliament was called for the 3d of November, 1534; and here, by means of the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, and other of his creatures, Henry managed to get passed anything he desired, both as regarded the succession of Elizabeth, the disinheriting of Mary, the annulling the papal jurisdiction, the substituting the royal supremacy in its place, and the spoliation of the first year's income of all spiritual preferments.

Moreover, an edict was made that the pope's name should be expunged from all Calendars and Indexes, and that in the Litany a form should be inserted, praying for deliverance 'from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his abominable enormities:' and, to add a spice of the ridiculous, the king issued a proclamation on the 7th of May, that no one at court should shave his beard or wear long flowing hair. He then tried to get the sanction of the French king and of the Lutheran princes of Germany for his acts, but neither of these political parties could be induced to join him, and this was the main cause of the retardation of the spreading of Lutheran doctrines in this country. He also endeavoured to gain Pole over to his side, but the only fruit of the appeal was the publication of the elegant work '*De Unione Ecclesiasticâ*.' This book was the cause of the king's furious attempt to destroy him, his brother, his mother, and his uncle. At last, finding all good men were against him, he began to practise the most horrid cruelty on various ecclesiastics. April 29th, 1535, five were tried, and

afterwards, May 4th, executed. The jury, Sanders says, were unwilling to convict them, and were only induced to do so by the king's repeated threats. On the 18th of June three more were put to death under circumstances of the most horrid cruelty. After enumerating several other victims, and it is worth while to observe that Sanders is both more particular in his account than Burnet, and more exact as to his dates, he proceeds to the cases of More and Fisher. The latter was tried on the 22d of June, and his head, after his execution, was exposed on London Bridge, and the longer it was kept there the more venerable its appearance became. Accordingly it was removed. More followed his friend on the 6th of July. Soon after this followed the bull of Pope Paul III., issued August 30th, 1535, for the condemnation of Henry, under the form of citing him to judgment, with the penalty of excommunication if he refused to appear. In October of the year 1535, he determined to visit the monasteries. Lee, who was appointed one of the visitors, was notorious for his profligacy. He made attempts on the chastity of the nuns, and reported scarcely anything but impurities, and this was the occasion of the bill for the suppression of the lesser monasteries under 700*l.* annual revenue, which passed on the 5th of February, 1536. The object of commencing with them was, that no opposition might be encountered from the mitred abbots of the larger ones, who sat in parliament, and the plea alleged was that discipline could not be so well observed in the smaller establishments. Thus 376 houses were suppressed, and an annual revenue of 120,000*l.* was confiscated to the king's use. Soon afterwards Catharine of Arragon died, January 6th, 1536. In this the author has again made a mistake of a single day. It was January 7th. And here Sanders has preserved, in a Latin translation, the letters that passed between her and her confessor, Forest, who was daily expecting death, but who survived the queen some time. Catharine, he says, ever imputed her unhappy marriage to the anger of God for Henry VII.'s putting to death the son of the Duke of Clarence, to secure the succession to the crown to his own children. Anne Boleyn, when the court went into mourning, paraded herself and her maids of honour in jewels and bright colours.

Sanders does not quote Horace, but probably he may have had in his mind the poet's expression :—

*Raro antecedentem scelestum  
Deseruit pede Pœna claudo.*

Certainly vengeance was not slow in overtaking Anne Boleyn, though it did not overwhelm her consort in guilt so quickly.

The queen having given birth to a lifeless and shapeless child,



reproached the king with it, alleging that it was due to her having seen him with that harlot, Jane, in his lap. The king replied, 'Take heart, my dearest, and you shall have no more cause to complain of me.' But the queen, seeing little hope of male offspring from the king, contrived to commit incest with her brother George, and that with the view of preserving the succession to the crown in the family of the Boleyns. She afterwards admitted to her favours four others. The king pretended ignorance till, on the 1st of May, during a tournament at Greenwich, he witnessed the queen dropping a handkerchief from a window, which was picked up by one of her lovers to wipe his face with. Henry, using this as a pretext for his wrath, immediately withdrew to Westminster, and on the next day Anne Boleyn, on her return to London, was arrested and sent to the Tower. Her passionate requests to be allowed to see the king were peremptorily denied, and, after a trial, on which her father sat as one of her judges, she was beheaded on the 19th of May. The marriage with Jane Seymour took place the next day, and thus was manifested the justice of God, rendering to every man according to his works. We will here translate Sanders' apostrophe to the queen, because it will convey to the reader, better than any lengthened description on our part, the tone which pervades his work. The two main objects are to vilify Elizabeth and to illustrate the exact retribution which God inflicts on sin. He seems to have been anxious to exhibit in minute incidents a commentary on the text, 'As I have done, so the Lord hath requited me.'

'Unhappy,' he calls her, 'in the wretched circumstances of her birth, education, marriage, and death; unhappy in that she ruined with herself her father, brother, and so many others; unhappy in being the rival and supplanter of one endowed with such nobility and virtue, one so utterly different from herself; but, above all other considerations, unhappy in having been the prime cause of the schism, and the origin of the utter ruin of her country by being the mother of a child who survived her, and filled up to overflowing the measure of her mother's iniquity.'—P. 170.

A very few days afterwards a Parliament and Convocation were assembled, viz. June 8th, 1536; and here the king intimated his dissatisfaction with the disinheriting of Mary in favour of Anne Boleyn's daughter, and signified, moreover, that it was necessary to establish some form of religious belief, which had of late become very lax. But, to avoid any appearance of returning to the Roman obedience, Cromwell was made Vicar-General, and given precedence in all causes ecclesiastical over the bishops and archbishops. In the following September

Cromwell issued his Injunctions, which amongst other things contained an order for the service to be used in the English language. And now the Act of the Six Articles was passed, establishing the doctrine of transubstantiation, communion in one kind, the celibacy of the clergy, the necessity for observing the vows of chastity and widowhood, the desirableness of private masses and auricular confession; and the denial of these was pronounced to be heresy, and subjected the offender to penalties accordingly.

And here the author pauses to remark, that a branch cut off from the unity of the Church cannot live and produce fruit; and that schism and heresy cannot stop where they will, but must develop into further separations. This he considers amply proved by the variety of heretical opinions which crept in in the following reigns, though he is content to rest his argument, for the present, upon the inability of the king, during his own lifetime, to stem the torrent of public opinion.

These doctrines Henry pressed on against the Lutherans and Zuinglians, and yet in many points he either partially or wholly agreed with them, and held many things inconsistently. Thus he agreed with these heretics that there was no such thing as a primacy of the see of S. Peter; that though there were seven Sacraments, only three, including penance, were instituted by Christ himself; prayers for the dead were commanded, but the doctrine of purgatory abolished; vows of chastity were upheld, but monks and nuns were absolved from the obligations of them; a reverence for holy things and saints was proclaimed, yet the shrines were despoiled of all their valuable jewels and relics.

The death of Anne Boleyn not producing the results that some had anticipated, of a return on the part of Henry to the faith which he had quitted, the Northern insurrection broke out. The insurgents came to a parley, and though the king had promised them a full pardon, yet in the following year, in the months of March, May, and June, several barons, abbots, and priests were executed. And this cruelty on the part of the king was avenged by God by the death of his favourite child, Henry, Duke of Richmond, which happened immediately afterwards.

On the 10th of October (it should be 12th), Prince Edward was born, and upon its being found impossible to save both lives, the king ordered the preference to be given to that of the child, alleging that he could get other wives, but that he could not ensure another son. The death of Jane Seymour again raised the hopes of the men of the old learning, as they were called, and Pope Paul III. still delayed issuing his bull dethroning Henry, and made a last attempt to regain him. Accordingly, he concerted measures with the Emperor and the French

king to send Pole, whom he had lately raised to the cardinalate, as legate into Belgium, with the fullest instructions and authority to act. He reached Paris, and Bryan was instantly sent to demand him of the French king. Francis, unwilling to offend either the pope or Henry, gave secret notice to Pole to quit his dominions if he would preserve his life. Pole retired to Cambray, and there heard that he had been proclaimed a traitor by Henry, and that a reward of 50,000*l.* had been offered for his head. The king, finding Pole had escaped him, began to wreak his vengeance on his family and friends; and, amongst others, his mother was executed, May 28th, 1541, and Sir Adrian Fortescue and Sir Thomas Dingley on the 10th of July.

It was now Cromwell's policy to effect a union with the German Protestants. It was he who had chiefly incensed the king against Pole as being addicted to the interests of the pope and the Emperor. He urged that it was in order to please the Emperor that Pole had been made a cardinal. He therefore did what he could to bring about an alliance with the Duke of Cleves, who, partly from love of heresy, and partly from fear of the Emperor, had joined in a secret league with Francis and the German princes.

Cromwell accordingly incited the king more and more against the Catholic party, and ordered to be put to death, or allowed to perish in prison, thirty-six Franciscans, amongst whom he specially mentions Antony Brorby, executed July 17th, Thomas Belsham, starved to death, August 3d, and Thomas Cort, July 27th, who died from neglect. He had previously put to death Forest, the queen's confessor, who was burnt in Smithfield by a slow fire placed under his feet, his arms being attached to two upright stakes. A ribald rhyme was made and printed and set up in the streets, as follows:—

‘Forestus frater, mendacii pater  
Qui mortis author voluit esse suæ;  
Per summam impudentiam negavit Evangelium  
Et regem esse caput Ecclesiæ.’

Nor was the severity of the king and his vicar-general exercised only on Catholics, as was shown by their consigning Lambert to the flames on the 22d of November. Again, not content with the living, even the memory of the dead was insulted, the statues and crosses throughout the country being, at the instigation of Cromwell, defaced, and especially the tombs of the three celebrated English martyrs, S. Thomas, S. Alban, and S. Edmund. From the first of these the king is said to have carried off twenty-six waggon-loads of spoil. But not content with this, he forbade, on pain of death, any commemoration of

his festival. And now, seeing there was no longer any hope, Paul III. fulminated his bull on the 1st of January, 1538, *pontificatûs quinto*.

The Parliament assembled April 28th, 1539, and a bill passed for the dissolution of all the monasteries; and on the 8th of July some more executions took place. Soon afterwards, a form of voluntary surrender was drawn up and sent round to the monasteries for the signatures of the abbots and brethren. When they could not succeed in forcing this upon the monks, they used violence, and November 14th (this should be November 15th), the Benedictine Abbots of Glastonbury and Reading, with two other priests, were executed; and on the 1st of December following, the Abbot of Colchester. The plunder of the religious houses was distributed or sold among the nobility, and even Catholics were compelled in some instances to buy the lands, in order that they might, as it were, appear to sanction the wickedness of the spoliation.

The next act is the marriage with Anne of Cleves. She arrived in London, January 3d, 1540, and was married three days afterwards. These nuptials had been hurried on by Cromwell, and were considered of great importance to the Protestant interest. The opportunity of an alliance with England was gladly embraced by the Duke of Cleves, who was afraid of the Emperor. But the whole transaction turned out quite contrary to the expectation of all parties. Cromwell was ruined by it; the Duke of Cleves lost his projected alliance with the French king; and soon afterwards the Emperor conquered all the German Protestant party.

Cromwell was created Earl of Essex, April 13th (this should be 18th), and five days after the session of Parliament began. His next act of cruelty was the imprisoning of Dr. Wilson and Bishop Sampson of Chichester, for performing an act of kindness to some poor men who had been imprisoned for denying the supremacy. The law which he procured to be enacted for condemning of treason an absent person without a trial by jury, was the very one under whose operation he was the first to suffer.

Unfortunately for the vicar-general, his royal master soon began to be very tired of Anne of Cleves, who was unable, from her ignorance of English, and the general staidness of her demeanour, to gain the king's good graces; though probably a more powerful inducement to part with her may be found in the political circumstances of the moment. In the first place, his actions failed to persuade the assembly at Smalcald to approve of the reformed scheme of religion established in England. Secondly, the great successes of the Emperor, and the com-

pliments that had recently passed between him and the French monarch, induced Henry to turn his thoughts towards making advances to Charles. Lastly, the king had fallen in love with Catharine Howard, so it became necessary to get rid of Anne either by death or divorce. The first step was to get rid of Cromwell. A plea was easily found in the fact that the vicar-general had subscribed in the king's name to the new Smalcaldic league. Now Henry had promised the Emperor that he would not do so, and accordingly, when the copy of the league was shown him by the Emperor with his name attached, denied that it had been done by his authority.

On the 8th of July, the king in a most friendly way ordered him to come next day to York House. Upon his arrival there the Duke of Norfolk, the uncle of Catharine Howard, arrested him for high treason. Ten days after, Cromwell was pronounced guilty of heresy, treason, felony, and bribery. He was beheaded in company with the infamous Lord Hungerford, and his property confiscated to the Crown. The comments of the Catholics upon these proceedings are thus given by our author.

‘Various were the sentiments and expressions of men on this act of the king’s. Some could not but wonder that his vicar-general, so recently elevated to the highest rank and given precedence over prelates and bishops, and who had exercised the highest authority in ecclesiastical causes, and even settled matters of faith, should have so suddenly fallen into such terrible crimes, and especially that of heresy. Others remarked that there was no necessity to suppose a vicar-general was always guarded by the Spirit of God. It was enough that he whose vicar-general he was should be possessed of such a privilege. It was enough that the Head of the Church should have this prerogative, and should be able both to correct the errors and cut off the head of his vicegerent. Some mockingly compared the fortunes of the heavenly vicar with those of Bryan, who still kept in favour with the king, and who usually was called his “Vicar of Hell.” All in fine remembered the passage in the Psalms, “I myself have seen ungodly in great power, and flourishing like a green bay-tree. I went by, and lo! he was gone: I sought him, but his place could nowhere be found.”’

The death of Cromwell was but the preliminary measure to the divorce of Anne. She herself afterwards gave Queen Mary an account of the method adopted, which was as follows, viz. that the king had sent to her, telling her that there were many reasons why it was inexpedient that their marriage should continue; and though he could easily attain her of heresy, and could find other methods of getting rid of her, yet he left it to

her to invent some decent pretext for pronouncing the marriage null and void. Upon this Anne came the next day to the Council and confessed that she was under a secret precontract of marriage at the time when she married the king. The Parliament accordingly pronounced for a divorce, and Henry, being thus at liberty, married Catharine Howard within eight days. Anne of Cleves afterwards avowed to Queen Mary that her confession had not a word of truth in it.

By a ludicrous inconsistency, it was now enacted by parliament that whenever two persons had been united in marriage *per verba de presenti*, but before the consummation of the marriage either of them should have contracted a second marriage and consummated it, the latter should stand good as against the first. And thus, whereas the law of nations had been *Nuptias non concubitus, sed consensus, facit*; Henry's law for the future was, on the contrary, *Nuptias non consensus, sed concubitus, facit*; yet, in spite of the law, the king divorced Anne of Cleves, with whom the marriage had not only been solemnized with the consent of both parties, but had been followed by a cohabitation of seven months' duration. The Protestants themselves were so ashamed of this law, that after the death of the king it was abrogated.

Though Henry had now married a lady of one of the old Catholic families, and, being free from any alliance with German Protestants, wished to cultivate the friendship of the Emperor, yet he was as violent against the men of the old learning as formerly. On the 30th of July, Abel, Powell and Fetherstone were put to death, nominally for denying the supremacy, really, perhaps, because they had been counsel for Catharine of Arragon. And on the same day three Zuinglian heretics, Barnes, Jerome and Gerard, were executed with them, being coupled together, one Catholic and one Protestant. Upon seeing this a courtier is observed to have said, 'Well, as Protestants are burnt for one thing, and Catholics for another, I mean to be of the king's religion, that is of no religion at all, for the future.'

On the 2d of August, Lawrence Cook, the Prior of Doncaster, with five others, suffered martyrdom for denying the supremacy. In the following year the diet at Ratisbon was held under the Emperor for the purpose of creating a concord in matters of religion, and the pope deputed Cardinal Contareni as his legate, and Henry sent Sir Henry Knevett, and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, to the meeting, partly with the view of representing to the German princes his moderation in matters of religion, and doing away with their prejudice against him on the score of his tardiness in joining with them, and partly in order



to unite with the Emperor, and further some plan of union with the Catholic Church. This project fell through, as the king was unwilling to submit to any confession or public recantation. And now again the vengeance of God overtook him, punishing him in the same way that he had offended. As he had been unfaithful to his first wife, so now another was unfaithful to him. Catharine Howard had scarcely been his wife two years, when she was convicted of adultery with Culpepper and Dereham, and as it appeared she had been guilty before her marriage as well as subsequent to it, a law was made that any lady professing to be a maid, whom the king should marry, should, upon her impurity being discovered, suffer death as a traitor, together with her paramour. However, the king anticipated the application of the law by marrying for his sixth wife a widow, who was happy only in this, that she survived him, and so escaped being put to death.

Whilst this was the state of domestic affairs in England, the whole of Europe was embroiled in war, and Henry took advantage of the state of affairs to join the Emperor, who appeared as it were to be at war with all the world, and his alliance was readily accepted. On the 23d of January he issued a proclamation assuming to himself the style of King of Ireland. This, says Sanders, was an insolent addition to the previously acknowledged title of *Dominus Hiberniæ*, which had originally been a grant from Hadrian IV., in the twelfth century, and considering he had abjured the papal supremacy, a piece of impertinence on a par with Queen Elizabeth's assumption of the title *Fidei Defensor*.

Henry, pursuing his arrogant course, made war on France and Scotland together, and, at the beginning of March, executed three more priests, one of them the cousin of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, for denying his supremacy.

We come now to 1544, in which year, in spite of the pillage of the monasteries, the king found himself poorer than he had ever been. He was obliged to exact more taxes than had been demanded for 500 years before him, and poverty, instead of disappearing as it was said it would do upon the dissolution of the monasteries, became rampant, the number of beggars being increased in the proportion of twenty to one. He was, moreover, obliged to have recourse to a depreciation of the currency. After this, in the Parliament of Nov. 24th, 1545, all the hospitals and colleges were suppressed. And now we come to the last act, which was the imprisonment of the Duke of Norfolk and the execution of his son, the Earl of Surrey. This is the last instance in point given by the author to illustrate the pervading sentiment of his book—

‘Per quæ quis peccat, per eadem castigatur.’

The very persons who had been the king's instruments in his villany, are chief sufferers at his hands. Not only was Surrey executed, but his eldest son, who was restored to his father's rank by Mary, was afterwards put to death by Elizabeth, whilst his son as well as his brother were, at the moment of the author's writing, kept in confinement by the same queen. And such, says he, was the gratitude shown to the Norfolk family by the child of Henry and Anne Boleyn, in return for the assistance they had rendered in the matter of the divorce from the illustrious Catharine of Arragon.

Scarcely a single individual, the author continues, who played a conspicuous part in that transaction, escaped from the infliction of divine vengeance in the way of temporal punishment. After having enumerated them, he proceeds with his history. Again Henry made an attempt to be reconciled to the see of Rome, and consulted some of his bishops on the point; but they were too much afraid to give him advice, and one of them told him that his wisdom exceeded that of other men, that he had abolished the Roman supremacy by divine help, and that there was nothing to fear, as his judgment had been confirmed by Parliament. Gardiner of Winchester alone advised him to call together a Parliament to consider so weighty a matter, and told him that if there were no time for that before his death, he should at least leave his wishes on the subject in writing. But no sooner had Gardiner quitted his presence, than the other courtiers, fearing that a return to the Roman obedience would involve a restoration of the Church goods which they had in their possession, persuaded him not to listen to such superstitious scruples of conscience. Still conscience seems to have pricked him in his last days, for on the 3d of January, 1547, twenty-five days before his death, he ordered the church of the Franciscans to be made into a parochial church, and mass was said in it, and a sermon preached by the Bishop of Rochester, in praise of the king's piety and munificence.

At the conclusion of this part of the work, in summing up the character of the king, the author takes occasion to observe that before his divorce he had ordered to be put to death two noblemen—one in obedience to his dying father's command, the other at the instigation of Wolsey—but that afterwards the executions he had ordered, or the deaths he had caused, may be counted as follows: 3, at least, if not 4 of his wives, 2 heroines, 2 cardinals, 12 of the higher nobility, 18 barons and knights, 13 abbots and priors, 77 monks and priests, besides a countless host of the upper and lower classes who are not enumerated. He died January 28th, 1547, at the same time when Luther's death occurred, and just two months before that of Francis I.

of France. Of the many stories that are told about his death, Sanders details this one: that at the last he asked for a cup of white wine, and turning round to one of his courtiers, remarked, 'We have lost everything,' and soon after expired, whispering from time to time the word 'monks.' The change of religion which, in spite of all the precautions in the king's will, took place in the succeeding reign, Sanders uses as a last illustration of the principle that God renders to every man according to his work.

Such is a very brief account of Sanders' celebrated work as far as regards the reign of Henry VIII. We have already ventured on one or two points of comparison between the Roman Catholic historian's short epitome of the reign, and the more elaborate narrative of the English historian of the Reformation. And we may add here, that the tone of Sanders' work is much more like historical truth than that of Burnet's. Though the latter had opportunity of reference to a splendid collection of originals that Sanders never could have seen, it is very remarkable that, with regard to the accuracy of dates and facts, Sanders is far superior to Burnet. Burnet's dates are nearly as often wrong as right, whilst with regard to individuals, he constantly makes mistakes from mere ignorance of the history of the period. Thus he confounds Pace and Pate. He mistakes an allusion to Catharine of Arragon for a reference to Anne Boleyn. He scarcely ever utters the words of an historian to whom he refers without materially altering the sense. If the one has an undeniable bias towards Rome, the other is equally prejudiced on the Protestant side; whilst Sanders had greatly the advantage in point of general knowledge of the doctrines of the Church, as well as of the nature of the heresies that sprang up in the sixteenth century. Burnet selected from the immense mass of papers which were open to his inspection, such as suited his purpose—Sanders went a good deal upon hearsay, and, occasionally, too eagerly grasped at stories which fell in with his undisguised hatred for Elizabeth and her mother.

For an abridged account of the ebb and flow of opinions, and the immense difference in kind of the Reformation under Henry, and that of the two succeeding reigns, probably no better guide than Sanders could be followed, if the reader is on his guard against his Roman prejudices and his credulity.

There are, however, two points of immense importance in forming a right estimate of the proceedings in the case of the divorce, in which Sanders is altogether right, and Burnet as entirely wrong in his view. They are, (1) the virginity of Catharine, and (2) the connexion of Henry with Mary Boleyn.

We venture to say that, considering the indirect nature of the proofs by which such matters have to be established, there are no disputed historical facts of the period that rest on a greater accumulation of evidence.

As both points are of considerable importance, we will devote a short space to each of them. Mr. Froude, in his recent '*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey*,' has thought proper entirely to deny the latter of these facts, and to treat the former as a matter of no consequence. Now this is simply to ignore the whole current of feeling of the time. The papal dispensation which had been given for the marriage of Catharine with Henry would never have been impugned by anybody who should have been assured of the non-consummation of the previous marriage with Arthur. Whatever might be thought of the papal dispensation for a marriage with a brother's widow who had had children by her first husband, neither Catholics nor Protestants of that day would have ventured to call in question the validity of a marriage with a virgin widow after such dispensation had been obtained. In consequence of this, Henry was extremely anxious to obtain the opinions of the Universities couched in general terms, forbidding such a marriage under all circumstances, and making no allusion to an exceptional case, which would be too uncommon to specify. Nevertheless, it was found difficult to get the Protestants to acquiesce in the king's wishes, and the determinations of the Universities are for the most part expressed in the form that such marriage, when the previous marriage has been consummated, is against the law of God.

The king, however, was determined to make his case as complete as possible, and so forced the Houses of Convocation to determine two separate questions—the question of the legality of a marriage so contracted, and the question of fact whether Arthur and Catherine had consummated their marriage. Both these points were decided by large majorities in the king's favour. We forbear to quote the filthy expressions (albeit they are in Latin) which the king condescended to make use of to show the possibility of the consummation—they may be seen in the volume of state papers—and we proceed to show the conclusive evidence on which the non-consummation of the marriage rests.

1. In the first place Catharine was married to Henry on the 11th of June, 1509, in the white veil, which was never at that time used by any but virgins.

2. The queen on her trial asserted it before all her judges, and Henry was afraid in the presence of Wolsey and others to deny that it was so.

3. The whole tone of Wolsey's correspondence shows that he knew the marriage had never been completed.

4. The title of Prince of Wales had been assumed by Henry a very short time after the death of Arthur. This we do not insist on as any positive proof; but it is necessary to notice it here, because it disproves the argument to the contrary on which historians, following Lord Bacon, have relied much: viz. that the not taking the title for nine months after the death shows that it was thought at least possible that there might be an heir to the crown by the first marriage. Now all these English historians ought to have known better; for there is a document quoted from the Rolls in Rymer's *Fœdera*, bearing date June 22d, 1502, which shows that within a few weeks after the death of Prince Arthur the title had been assumed by the second son.

5. Cardinal Pole asserts that Henry had confessed the fact to the Emperor.

6. And now let us collect what additional evidence the Simancas Records supply. From a letter of May 10th, five weeks after Arthur's death, it appears that Estrada was instructed by Ferdinand and Isabella to conclude a marriage for Catharine with Henry, Prince of Wales. This shows that the title had been assumed even earlier than the English document gives evidence for. And if there had been any chance of an heir to the throne of England, it is certain that no negotiation of this kind could have been entered into; nor, again, would there have been any fears as regarded the treatment which the mother of the heir-apparent to the crown might receive from her father-in-law. We should almost have been disposed to think that this paper shows that it was at the time very well known that the marriage had never been consummated. But it is necessary to be cautious in inferences from isolated facts. And it is plain, from the subsequent despatches, that Ferdinand and Isabella had not at this time been informed how matters stood as regards this point. One thing only is certain, that it was known there were no hopes of an heir to the throne from the late marriage. What they knew or guessed beyond this was all derived from a letter which had been written to them by Donna Elvira, the first lady of the bedchamber, who had informed them that the Princess Catharine and the late Prince of Wales had never lived together as man and wife. From another letter, dated May 29th, it appears that Ferdinand and Isabella were in expectation of the King of England's behaving in an unhand-some and niggardly way towards the princess, and evidently feared that he would withdraw her dowry, which had been promised for her life. Before the 14th of June they had

ascertained that Henry had refused to give up the 100,000 crowns of marriage portion, and therefore, as the Spanish king and queen suppose, is the more bound to provide liberally for her. Another despatch written two days later seems to show that it was expected that the estates would be given to her by the King of England, in order that he may have a pretext for retaining the 100,000 crowns, and demanding the remaining half which had not yet been paid. To provide against this unanswerable demand, the Duke of Estrada was instructed to say that, 'the marriage being dissolved, the dowry returns to the father and mother who gave it, and that this is clearly stated both in canon and civil law, and no doctor can bring forward anything to the contrary. Therefore not only are we not bound to pay the King of England that which still remains unpaid of the dowry, but he is obliged to pay back to us what he has already received.' The same letter further cautions the ambassador not to let out the Spanish king and queen's wishes in this matter. This is the letter which, from its being written wholly in cypher, shows what were the real sentiments of the writers, and from its concluding paragraph it is clear that they were not yet certainly informed as to the fact of the consummation. It is dated from Toledo, June 16th, 1502.

It is plain enough, from the tenor of the despatches of this period, that the hope of Isabella was that the marriage had been consummated, because if it had not been it would not have been so certain that she and Ferdinand could insist on the dowry which had been guaranteed to the princess from England being secured to her. Very shortly afterwards, however, Ferdinand and Isabella found themselves in somewhat different circumstances; there was danger of being involved in a war with France, and they became more and more anxious to press matters forward for the marriage of their daughter with Henry Prince of Wales. Accordingly, on the 12th of July, Isabella wrote to Estrada, giving him instructions as follows: 'Therefore, without saying anything about this, since it is already known for a certainty that the said Princess of Wales, our daughter, remains as she was here (for so Donna Elvira has written to us), endeavour to have the said contract agreed to immediately, without consulting us; for any delay that might take place would be dangerous.' We should be glad to transcribe the whole of this diplomatic letter, but we must content ourselves with saying that it contains directions, written partly in one cypher partly in another, how to make the best bargain with the King of England. The hurrying on the contract because of the certainty of the non-consummation of the previous marriage, does not admit of the interpretation



that 'this was to be done because there could be any doubt that a papal dispensation was obtainable,' for such dispensation, though not common, had been given both in ancient and more recent times, not only in favour of princes, but on application by subjects. It appears to us to admit of only one interpretation, viz. that which implies a fear on Isabella's part that the non-consummation may be urged as a reason for treating the marriage as null, and not rendering the princess her dowry of the third part of the revenues of Wales, Cornwall, and Chester. This document is of the 12th of July. The next cyphered despatch that alludes to this point is a very long letter from Isabella to Estrada, written April 12th, 1503, just after the intelligence of the death of the Queen of England had reached Spain. It is the most curious of all the Simancas Records, for it distinctly reveals a plan which Henry VII. had conceived of marrying his own daughter-in-law. With this we are not concerned at present, but only with one sentence in the letter, which runs as follows: 'With this view say, that on account of the love which we bear to the King of England and his kingdom, we consented with much good will to give the Princess of Wales in marriage to the Prince of Wales. But that God having taken the latter to Himself before the matrimony was consummated, we find by letters received from England that the King of England desires the Princess of Wales should marry the present Prince of Wales.' It is important to observe that these are words which Estrada is directed to use to the king, and they plainly show that Isabella was at this time fully persuaded of the want of consummation of the marriage, and took it quite for granted that the point was fully established.

There are two other allusions in the Simancas Records to the same subject; and, to make the evidence as complete as possible, we must just extract the passages which refer to it. The first is in the treaty between Ferdinand and Isabella and Henry VII. Here it is stated, in formal and technical language (June 23d), that 'the papal' dispensation is required because the said Princess Catharine had on a former occasion contracted a marriage with the late Prince Arthur, brother of the present Prince of Wales, whereby she became related to Henry, Prince of Wales, in the first degree of affinity, and because her marriage with Prince Arthur was solemnized according to the rites of the Catholic Church, and afterwards consummated. The meaning of the passage is obvious. It was intended to cover any objection that might be alleged against the dispensation, by providing even for the possibility of any future objection, grounded on a supposition which it might be equally difficult to prove or disprove. We say this would be an obvious solution of the

difficulty ; but we are not left to conjecture on the point, for the Instructions of Ferdinand to De Rojas, his ambassador at Rome, are still extant, telling him ' he has decided to marry his daughter, the Princess Catharine, to Henry, Prince of Wales.' The following is added :—' That this marriage requires the dispensation of the pope. In the clause of the treaty which mentions the dispensation of the pope, it is stated that the Princess Catharine consummated her marriage with Prince Arthur. The fact, however, is, that although they were wedded, Prince Arthur and the Princess Catharine never consummated the marriage. It is well known in England that the princess is still a virgin ; but as the English are much disposed to cavil, it has seemed to be more prudent to provide for the case as though the marriage had been consummated, and the dispensation of the pope must be in perfect keeping with the said clause of the treaty. The right of succession depends on the undoubted legitimacy of the marriage.' This letter was written on the 23d of August, 1503. A few days afterwards, the pope died, and his successor, Pius III. was elected in the following month. Julius II. succeeded on the 1st of November, 1503, and dated the dispensation on the 26th of December, under the well-known form that the marriage had perhaps been consummated. Now we submit that, supposing M. Bergenroth had been an advocate for the queen's side of the question, and had forged these records, he could hardly have made out a more skilful case. And we say, that any person who shall hereafter wish to defend the king's side of the divorce case, must endeavour, in the first place, to prove that the volume of Simancas Records which M. Bergenroth has presented us with, is from beginning to end a forgery.

We now proceed to the second point, viz. the nature of the connexion of Henry with Mary Boleyn, premising only, that affinity in canon law is caused equally by a legal and illegal intercourse. If, therefore, there had been such intercourse with Mary, it would have been impossible for Henry to solemnize a marriage with Anne Boleyn without a special dispensation for the purpose from the pope.

Now we fully admit that we have no means of proving the fact that Sanders alleges, that Mary Boleyn confessed the matter to Catharine. At the same time, there is nothing to disprove it, nor is it altogether improbable ; especially as the fact of the connexion must have been tolerably notorious. That fact is established by a very singular amount of concurrent testimony. That Cardinal Pole openly charged Henry with it would be to our minds very good evidence, but the opinion, or the statement of Pole, may not be so conclusive to others ; and Mr.

Froude in his history, it will be remembered, systematically disparages Pole's testimony. It was but natural that he should, for Pole is a formidable witness against Mr. Froude's whole theory of the reign. If, however, Cardinal Pole's assertion that he knew of the connexion is not conclusive, there is a state paper published by Herbert, and afterwards reproduced by Burnet, Tierney, and others, which all but states the fact in direct terms. We are not here producing any new evidence, but we say that historians have not laid as much stress on this document as it is entitled to bear. The document alluded to is 'The Bull of Dispensation,' signed by Clement VII. at Orvieto, December 17th, 1527. The bull was drawn up in England under Wolsey's direction, and was sent by him, through Gardiner and Fox, to be signed by the pope. Regarded, therefore, in the light of an official document, it is a dispensation granted by the pope to Henry to contract another marriage, on the hypothesis that the marriage with Catharine was annulled. But looked at from the point of view of its having been sent from England, it is a request on the part of the king to be allowed to marry whom he pleased, if it should be determined that he was free from any obligation to Catharine. Of course, therefore, if he was bent on marrying Anne Boleyn, an intention which it will not be doubted had been entertained long before the winter of 1527, he would specify any points which would particularly require a dispensation. The object, next to the gratification of his own licentious passion, was to secure an heir to the crown whose legitimacy should be beyond all dispute. It would have been too barefaced to expect the pope to give him leave to marry Anne Boleyn by name. But if this was not the object of the clause providing for a marriage with one who had previously been contracted in marriage, but had not completed the marriage, even though, by an act of illicit intercourse, she were related to the king in the first degree of affinity, we ask what other possible solution of the difficulty is there. There is no other instance on record of a bull either being asked for, or granted, with such a clause inserted in it; and the two allusions can only be explained as meant to include the case of Anne Boleyn, who had been contracted to Percy, and who, by the unfortunate connexion of her sister Mary with the king, stood, according to canon law, in the first degree of affinity to him. We have nothing here to do with the impertinence of the king, expecting one pope to dispense for the very same degree of affinity which he wished him to condemn his predecessor for dispensing with. We are simply establishing the fact that the king had been engaged in an intrigue with Mary Boleyn. Now there is absolutely nothing to set against this argument. However, as some

historians have professed, notwithstanding their knowledge of this document's existence, to disbelieve Sanders' story about Mary Boleyn, we proceed to the next evidence.

At the time when Henry had procured the condemnation of Anne, whether innocent or guilty—for that is a point which will probably never now be determined—he was, for some reason or other, so incensed against her, that he determined to have it decreed that the marriage, solemnized between himself and the unfortunate queen was, and always had been, null and void. To obtain this it was necessary that some ground should be alleged, and Anne was induced (it is impossible now to say by what promises) to confess to the archbishop some impediment. Burnet supposes this impediment to have been the precontract with Percy, which, through hope of some favour being shown her, she was brought to confess, although Percy had himself on oath denied it. Dr. Lingard supposes, and we have no doubt whatever that the supposition is correct, that the confession did not relate to this point, but to the affair of her sister. His opinion is grounded on the wording of the statute passed just afterwards, viz. 'that since certain impediments of consanguinity 'and *affinity*, according to God's law, arise from the intercourse 'of the two sexes, if it chance any man to know carnally any 'woman, then all and singular persons being in any such degree 'of consanguinity or *affinity* to any of the parties so carnally 'offending, shall be deemed and adjudged to be within the cases 'and limits of the said prohibition of marriage.' Now here is the first mention, in any statute of the period, of *affinity* being created by illicit intercourse: and it is not to be accounted for on any other principle, than its being applicable and its being meant to apply to the late annulment of the king's marriage. If there is any other possible interpretation we should like to see it. The case, however, is even stronger than Dr. Lingard knew of. He had not seen the treatise which Cranmer had drawn up against the validity of Catharine's marriage, and for the legality of that of Anne Boleyn, where the exact contradictory of this doctrine of affinity was asserted and elaborately defended by the archbishop, on the very ground that the doctrine of an affinity created in such way as this was a mere invention of the schools and ecclesiastical courts, and was not to be found in Scripture. Alas! English Churchmen little know to what strange uses that argument of want of Scripture evidence has been put. With Cranmer's duplicity we are not here concerned. Suffice it to say, that Sanders was fully justified in saying that Henry and his abettors had to eat their own words, and were forced to condemn their own acts.

And now to continue our notice of Sanders' mistakes and

Burnet's animadversions thereupon. It is needless to notice smaller things in which Sanders was not exactly accurate, and in giving an account of which Burnet first exaggerated Sanders' error, and then in impugning it, went into a mistake in the opposite direction; for this is upon the whole a true description of the animadversions made by the Bishop of Salisbury on his antagonist. One little instance shall suffice. Sanders observed that the prince Arthur when he married was *viadum attingens decimum quintum ætatis annum*, and adds that he was sick of a lingering disease. Burnet's reply is, that as he was born on the 20th of September, 1486, he was fifteen years old, and two months passed, when he married. Now here Burnet has overstated the matter; it is true it is only by a few days, and the matter itself is not of the smallest importance. But when he says that the 'lingering disease' is contradicted by records, he is speaking out of book, for there are no records to shew that Prince Arthur did not begin to decay till the Shrovetide following, nor that his decay was imputed to his excesses. Now, on the contrary, it is plain from the Simancas Records that whether Prince Arthur had any lingering disease or not, he certainly died of the plague. We are not concerned to adjust what is after all a mere literary quarrel. But there are other points at issue between the two historians which we may attend to, as they are more important in an historical point of view.

And first for the general view taken of the marriage of Henry with his brother's widow. Sanders is entirely right in saying that it was agreed to by all that the thing was by dispensation lawful, and that no man spoke against it, and that after his father's death, though Henry had at one time promised his father not to marry Catharine, yet the espousals took place on the 3d of June. But Burnet has thought proper to cavil at this statement, and with a mere *ignoratio elenchi* has asserted that Warham spoke against the marriage. Now it is true Warham did not like the marriage, but his objections were entirely overruled by the papal dispensation, and neither he nor any other ecclesiastic or layman of the time would have thought of calling in question its entire legality. Again in 1526, when the first question was raised as to the pope's power to dispense in such a case, Sanders is right in saying that Henry had already determined whom he would marry, and that he spent some time in trying to find out what could be said against the marriage, and found nothing, and that if there were any ambiguities in the pope's first letters, they were cleared by other letters which Ferdinand of Spain had afterwards procured. Burnet is again entirely wrong in his answer to this. He says Anne Boleyn was not at court at the time, and that she was only fifteen years old. Now

the only question is whether Anne Boleyn was seventeen or twenty-five. She was born, according to some, in 1501, according to others, in 1509. But she was certainly not less than seventeen, and as certainly was at court in 1526.

Again, the answer that he gives to the paragraph that the king spent a year in trying to invalidate the marriage, is utterly mistaken. Burnet observes that 'In that time all the bishops of England except Fisher declared under their hands and seals that they thought the marriage unlawful.' As Burnet had not had access to the State Paper Office at the time when he penned this sentence, his mistake is excusable. Nevertheless it is a gross blunder. By gross, in this instance, we mean considerable, *i.e.* of considerable importance, for on our acceptance or rejection of Burnet's statement depends the whole view which may be taken of the acquiescence of the ecclesiastics of this country in the decisions of the Roman pontiff.

He ought to have known that no one at that time would have questioned the decision of the pope. And the account of the transaction to which he alludes has since been published in Rymer. From this document it appears, not that all the bishops of the realm, with the exception of Fisher, declared under their hands and seals that they thought the marriage unlawful, but that eight of them, including Fisher, declared that they thought there was ground for examining into the validity of the dispensation; a very different matter, because the validity of a dispensation might on various grounds admit of doubt, as, for instance, because of the falsity of an allegation on which it should prove to have been granted. And this was actually one of the grounds on which Wolsey tried to induce Fisher to doubt of the legality of this particular dispensation.

Again, as regards the second letter said to have been obtained by Ferdinand, Burnet, who lived more than a century after Sanders, had the opportunity of knowing that there was a breve supplementary to the original bull, because he had seen the transcript of it printed by Herbert in his history. But Sanders' account is substantially correct, and Burnet's arguments for the forgery of the breve are scattered to the winds by the revelations of the Simancas documents. Till the publication of this volume it was impossible to say positively whether the breve were genuine or not. Some very considerable arguments were urged against its genuineness. And though Dr. Lingard made an able reply to all of them, yet he was himself content with the modest declaration that he thought the breve was in all probability genuine. The history of the case is familiar to all who are acquainted with Burnet's work or with Herbert's '*History of Henry the Eighth*,' but may be briefly detailed.



During the trial, and after objections had been urged against the bull of dispensation, it was alleged that a breve had been found in Spain, that supplied most of the material defects of the bull. One of these defects was, that no reason had been urged in the request for the bull, excepting the desire that peace might be continued between the two crowns; the breve, however, stated that the dispensation was asked for that and divers other reasons. There was, moreover, this difference between the bull and the breve, that the former stated that the marriage had been *perhaps* consummated; the latter stated the fact, without the word *perhaps*. The extreme opportuneness of the breve, of course, rendered it suspected, and the date was even more suspicious, for it was dated by mistake exactly like a bull, and not like a breve, it being notorious that the year for breves and bulls commences at a different epoch, which the forgers of the breve, it was alleged, had forgotten. The best argument that could have been produced for the genuineness has been entirely overlooked. It is this, that no forger of the year 1527, would have stated the consummation, which was the very point Catharine was most strenuous in denying on the trial. But the true explanation of the whole difficulty of the case may be gathered from several allusions in the Simancas papers. From these it appears that the bull of dispensation was not sent either to England or into Spain for some years after it was granted. From the instructions sent by Ferdinand to De Rojas, his ambassador at Rome, to which we have already referred, it is evident how anxious the Spanish king and queen were about the succession to the English throne, and how earnestly desirous they were that the dispensation of the pope should be in perfect keeping with the clause of the treaty in which the consummation had been taken for granted. It is extremely probable, therefore, that the want of agreement between the terms of the treaty and the terms of the bull, in which a doubt on the consummation was thrown, would annoy them much, and that they would endeavour to obtain such remedy for this as might be procurable. Exactly six months after the bull was dated, Ferdinand and Isabella expressed their dissatisfaction that the bull had not yet been sent. In a letter to Estrada, dated June 26th, 1504, they say:—‘As for the dispensation for the marriage of the Prince of Wales and the Princess of Wales, our children, our ambassador who is at Rome has told us in many of his letters of the representations he made on our part to Pope Pius, and also to Pope Julius, who has granted it by word of mouth. But the pope is delaying to send the despatch in writing, as he is waiting until the embassy, which is coming from England to do him homage,

'shall arrive. Our ambassador has, therefore, written to say 'he hopes to despatch it, at the latest, immediately on the 'embassy from England having arrived at Rome. We have, 'moreover, written to him desiring him to urge the pope to 'grant it immediately, and have told him not to cease from 'his endeavouring to obtain it until it be despatched. We have 'also desired him to get the English ambassadors to join with 'him in this matter, telling him to aid the said ambassadors to 'obtain all such matters as affect the king of England.' From another despatch, written ten days later by the pope to Henry VIII. we find that the dispensation, though dated more than six months earlier, was not granted. The pope says, 'He had never 'intended to withhold the dispensation, and all that has been said 'to the contrary is an invention of ill-intentioned persons.' He adds, that he has somewhat delayed to dispense with the obstacles to the marriage between the Princess Catharine and Henry Prince of Wales, but has done so only from the wish to consider the case more maturely. It was not till the 10th of August that Estrada wrote to Queen Isabella, informing her that the dispensation had arrived. Estrada says Henry sent it directly to him in order that he might show it to the princess. This, however, can only have been a kind of breve, for the same letter states that the bulls will not arrive before the middle of October, and upon their arrival, the king, it is said, would communicate them on All Saints' Day to the principal persons in the kingdom. Again, on the 23d of October, De Puebla, writing to Ferdinand and Isabella, says, 'I heard from the king that 'notwithstanding what the pope had written to him in his 'breve, the copy of which is inclosed, the dispensation had not 'yet been despatched. But he cannot tell whether the cause 'was that his ambassador, by whom the pope said he would 'send it, was ill, or whether the delay had been occasioned by 'the French. He said, moreover, that your highnesses must 'not, on your side, neglect so important a business.'

On the 28th of November, Henry VII. wrote again to Pope Julius II. reminding him of his promise by letters and by word of mouth to send the dispensation by Robert Sherborne, who had, however, arrived without it, and asking 'that it may be 'granted as soon as possible, and that it may be delivered at 'once to the English ambassadors who are remaining at Rome.' A week later, December 5th, 1504, De Puebla writes to Ferdinand and Isabella (some days after Isabella's death), entreating them to write to the pope again about the dispensation. The bull was finally despatched February 22d, 1505, in a letter from the pope to Henry, carried by the Bishop of Worcester, which is extant in Herbert's 'Henry VIII.' The bishop, how-

ever, had not set off with it on March 17th, for on that day he wrote from Rome to Henry VII. to say that he was coming with the bull; that it had grieved his holiness to learn that copies had been sent from Spain to England, which had been sent, under seal of secrecy, to Isabella for her consolation on her deathbed. Now, whether or not the breve which had been sent to England was the same with that sent into Spain before the bull arrived, is perhaps not quite certain. But it is plain that both of these breves were written long after the date which they bore; and this does away with the whole difficulty about the date of the breve being in the same year with that of the bull. It was drawn up by a scribe from the bull, and the different practice of dating being forgotten, the exact date was copied. As regards the difference in wording, nothing is more natural than that, if request was made by Queen Isabella for a form which should correspond to the words of the treaty between Spain and England, for the very preservation of which alliance the dispensation was ostensibly granted, the pope should in his breve, intended only for the eyes of the Queen of Spain, and therefore not registered at Rome, state the matter in such terms as should be most for her consolation; whilst the fact that the breve was alleged to be found amongst De Puebla's papers falls in exactly with the hypothesis we have been framing.

As our object is to direct people's attention to Sanders' work, and not to uphold it as in all its accounts correct, we just notice that Sanders is again right in saying that 'Wolsey, before his return from France, sent Gambara to the pope, desiring him to name himself vicar of the papacy during the captivity.' Burnet's reply is, that 'This was not done till almost a year after this, and the motion was sent by Staphileus, Dean of the Rota.' Now, here not only does Burnet betray his ignorance, for Staphilius was not Dean of the Rota at all, but Sanders' exact accuracy shows that he had access to documents at Rome or elsewhere, of which Burnet knew nothing.

When Sanders comes to matters which depend upon English records, he is less accurate. Thus he makes Bryan and Gardiner the bearers of the first message to the pope. It is evident that he confuses Bryan with Foxe. He speaks of Gardiner as having lately been taken into the confidence of the king, and not, as Burnet misrepresents him, as calling him a secretary of state. And he seems to confound the subsequent mission of Bryan with the first mission, the truth being that Knight carried the first despatch, and Gardiner and Foxe the next, which was sent two or three months later. Bryan did not go to Rome till near the end of the following year. The mistake, however, is of

small importance. Bryan and Gardiner were at Rome in 1529, and perhaps Sanders did not know that they had not been there continually from the end of 1527. Again, state papers confirm Sanders' view that they made the pope believe that the queen would willingly retire into a monastery. Burnet's preposterous notion, that the pope first suggested this, has no sanction whatever from any documents. On the contrary, the motion not only came from England, but the proposition was made to the pope, that if Catharine and Henry should both take the vows, he should afterwards dispense with the king's performance of his vow, and this failing, should dispense with his having two wives at once. Again, as regards the bribery and intimidation by which the opinions of the English and foreign Universities were obtained, Sanders is, in the main, right, and Burnet wrong, whilst Burnet's own account of the Cardinal Sanctorum Quatuor being won by a bribe of 4,000 crowns, is proved to be false by records which show that the bribe was indignantly refused.

For the respective estimates of Cranmer, it would require a biography to adjust the rights of the case. Those who take upon themselves to defend the character of Cranmer, have a hard task to account for his protestation that he did not mean to obey the pope when he took the oath of canonical obedience; his conduct in Anne Boleyn's case, as well as in that of Anne of Cleves, as likewise for many other passages in his life.

Sanders is wrong in placing the action of *præmunire* brought against the clergy in 1532 instead of 1531, and in speaking of Cranmer as archbishop at the time. And he has, in several other cases, mistaken the time at which the events which he narrates took place, and particularly has misplaced the Act of the Six Articles.

Burnet accuses him of forgery, in publishing the beautiful letters which passed between Catharine and Father Forest, but their genuineness is attested by other evidence. Sanders, again, is wrong in attributing the new form of consecrating bishops to Henry VIII., as it dates from the succeeding reign.

As regards the story of Jane Seymour's having been sacrificed to preserve the life of the prince, it is certainly by no means improbable, but we are not aware that it rests on any contemporary evidence. Burnet's reply is, that she died two days after. He might have made a better defence if he had told the true state of the case, that she survived for twelve days. This is the strongest evidence against Sanders' account, as it is not likely any one would survive the Cæsarian operation so long.

Let it not be supposed that our object has been to write up Sanders. We only wish to draw attention to him, as to a

writer who was nearly contemporary with the events which he narrates, and who evidently had access to information from foreign sources which Protestant historians have not enjoyed. That he was credulous and prejudiced it is impossible to deny; but his unsupported assertions are, on all grounds, entitled to more credit than those of Burnet, who can never be trusted except when he gives a reference, and who will generally be found to have misrepresented the author whom he quotes. But we trust we shall not be thought to be speaking disrespectfully of the other historians of the Reformation, whether writers of the more full and detailed accounts, or those who have given the history in an abridged and condensed form, if we say that the history of the Reformation of the Church of England yet remains to be written.

---

ART. VII.—*Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into certain Colleges and Schools.* London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1864.

A COMMISSION was issued in the autumn of 1861 to inquire into the state of the Public Schools. It consisted of Lord Clarendon, Lord Devon, Lord Lyttelton, Mr. Twistleton, Sir Stafford Northcote, Professor Thompson, Mr. H. H. Vaughan, with Mr. Montague Bernard acting as secretary. The schools included in it were Eton, Winchester, Westminster, Charterhouse, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Harrow, Rugby, and Shrewsbury. And its terms were an authority to examine into the funds and endowments, the government, the system and course of study, the method, subjects, and extent of instruction, and generally into the condition of these schools. The fruit of its labours was presented to Parliament in the spring of 1864, embodied in a blue-book which has attracted more interest than usually falls to the lot of such publications. And no one can complain that the result, so far, is inadequate to the importance of the subject, the length of time bestowed upon it, or the personal and intellectual eminence of the Commissioners. They have had a difficult duty before them, and they appear to have performed it courteously and well: without, on the one hand, shrinking from the comprehensive authority entrusted to them; or, on the other, arousing unnecessary opposition, or forgetting the regard due to those into whose supposed deficiencies and abuses they had to explore. No one will read the full, careful, and in most respects admirable report which they have put out without feeling that they have spared themselves no time nor toil, and inflicted upon others no pain which could be spared. They appear to have questioned every one from whom it was likely that any information might be gathered; and it was only from the pardonable opposition of the respective head masters that they were prevented from putting each school to the practical test of submitting a certain proportion of its boys to a common examination. Short of this they have done all in the way of inquiry that could be done: they have examined the reports of the French Minister of Instruction; they have obtained through the Minister of Education in Prussia an account of the principles, the practices, and the results of German schools; they have put to the question at home, verbally or in writing, governors, fellows,



head masters, assistants, college tutors, men of note in modern languages or natural sciences, old public-school men who have distinguished themselves in their school days or in after life, parents who have themselves been educated in the schools, or who have sons there now, undergraduates who have lately left, boys who are still there, great scholars and great cricket players, and no doubt great dunces—all, in fact, who might be supposed capable of throwing any light upon any point of public school education. Whether anything will follow directly from this elaborate inquiry, beyond the publicity of the results of it, remains to be seen. The Commissioners have not hesitated to give effect to their conclusions by suggestions of reform to each school. But it is one thing for a body of men, however able, well-informed, and impartial, and however careful to avoid sweeping changes, to propose a scheme of amendments: another thing for masters of schools placed under varying conditions, kept tight bound by strong associations and local traditions, and precluded by their position from theories or experiments, to put them into practice. An institution of the peculiar and in some respects anomalous nature of a public school, with customs which are based not upon any fixed laws, but which have grown up slowly from century to century, moulded more by habit and precedent, and what seems caprice, than by any formal code of rules or any force from without, cannot be reformed all in a day. Nor does it appear that this is contemplated. Some of the recommendations, in which the report is so prolific, it is proposed at an indefinite period to render compulsory by Act of Parliament; others, of a nature which cannot properly become the subject of legislation, are to be left to the discretion of the respective governors or head masters, as the case may be.

The vice of an inquiry of this sort is that it is practically inoperative. It raises expectations which it cannot satisfy; it exposes defects, but supplies no remedies. It would be a real evil if the notions of any half-dozen men upon the education of the upper classes of the country were to be enforced upon the schools where that education is being carried out; but if this is not to be, the Commission ends in an inquiry, and nothing more. And except in starting a reform of various abuses which have gradually crept into the management of the funds of some of the larger endowments—abuses which seem unavoidable in the case of all corporate landowners—our impression is that the publication of their investigations is the true ending of the labours of the Commissioners. The internal economy of these schools may have been kept too long hidden from view, may have been too long immoveable: the subjects of their instruction

may have been too narrow, and the treatment of their scholars may have been influenced too much by the usages of a past generation : their minds may have clung too tenaciously to the letter, and have made too small an allowance for the circumstances of their foundation ; but now there is no longer any danger that they will retrograde or stand still. The requirements of the Universities, the standard of the scholarship of the day, the reputation of the masters, the self-love of the higher boys, the watchfulness of many at least of the parents, the competition between school and school, the intellectual tone of good society, will all help to keep up the level of public school education. And it is out of the question to suppose that by any periodical pressure from without, any artificial forcing, any parliamentary constraint the standard can be permanently raised : it must find its own level, unmolested by interference with the laws which govern it. The problems which lie clustering about the surface of the subject :—whether or not too much dependence is placed upon the old classical languages as an educational basis ; whether, as a rider to this, it is desirable to incorporate modern tongues with them, and to what extent ; whether in the school course time can be found for such accomplishments as music and drawing, or regard can be had to the aptitudes or the future callings of individual boys ; what number of boys each master can fairly control and teach ; beyond what limit a school would become so large as to cease to be one in tone, and feeling, and society,—these, and a thousand matters of detail, are gradually working out their own solution. There is no need that they should be settled all at once. Public opinion and the interests of those in charge of them will take care that they work towards a settlement. A Royal Commission, no doubt—by the evidence which it accumulates, which would otherwise be inaccessible, by its investigations, its impartiality, and the inquisitorial powers entrusted to it—clears out from the way numberless difficulties ; but should the next step be taken, and any attempt be made by legislative pressure or otherwise to hasten the natural course of such questions, the result will be, not that the questions will be determined once for all, but that a precedent will be supplied for a periodical opening and discussion of them. While, then, we think the Commission has been beneficial, we think that the benefit arises from the impetus which all scholastic subjects will receive from the report being made public, from the opportunities given of comparing one school with another, from the insight which the outer world is allowed to get into these hitherto sacred precincts, from the knowledge which the masters have that their systems are being and will continue to be criticised, and from all the indirect

advantages which accrue to such questions from their being exposed to the discussion of many minds of many opinions, instead of their remaining the special property of a few minds, and those few not without natural prejudices.

The information which the report gives of the resources and the expenditure of the property of the schools is a matter of special, rather than general interest. We were glad, however, to mark the sense they entertain of the value of endowments, especially as an onslaught has lately been made upon them. In a speech recently delivered on topics of education by a late minister, whose abilities and information, and aversion to leaving things alone, no one questions, it was said, 'If you want to preserve—like the fly in amber, like a fossil or a crystal—the prejudices, the ignorance, and the mistakes of one age for the full blaze of light prevailing in another, there is no such expedient as an endowment.' Now no doubt an endowment has a conservative tendency; it perpetuates the habits of thought of a different generation; it gathers round itself the usages and traditions of the past; those who reap the benefit of it are, for the most part, brought up under its shadow and inherit the spirit which it diffuses. But granting this to be an evil—and it is a large admission;—granting that what is preserved from a preceding age is necessarily ignorance and error; that an endowment has the strange attribute of dissolving the good and petrifying the bad: are there no compensations? Do the 300,000*l.* a year which are said to be settled upon schools and colleges in this country, confer upon us of this generation nothing but the prejudices and the deficiencies, the obsolete learning, the little Latin and the less Greek of the twenty generations which have elapsed since University was first endowed, or William of Wykeham made provision for the support of his fellows and scholars at the College of S. Mary at Winchester? To enumerate the very names of eminent men who have been educated upon the proceeds of endowments, an education which otherwise they must have foregone, and by which the foundation of their future eminence was laid, would require pages. An endowment is essential to the mere existence of a seat of learning, and a university without some permanent property attached to it could never hold its own for many generations, even in a new country. A single unendowed school may prosper as long as it is large and popular, but let its numbers from any cause diminish, as was the case at Harrow, under the rule which preceded that of Dr. Vaughan, and the whole power and value of the place vanishes; it fluctuates with every tide, every wind of popularity, and is always in danger of becoming subservient to the public opinion of the day, be its demands

good or bad. While an endowment, on the contrary, forms a nucleus round which in course of time have collected—we must speak in the past, for it is unlikely, from the insecurity engendered by the present practice of dealing with such bequests, that charity will be conferred to any extent in this way just now—*prestige*, a name, associations, a body of learned men, a standard of learning, all which attracts the imagination, or spurs the ambition, or supplies the needs of rising intellects, with which to withstand the popular fancies and the wilder theories of the passing day. It is hard to deny that the present condition of our public schools—which, with all their inconsistencies and shortcomings, are so great an object of national pride—is very much due to the independent tone which Eton and Winchester, through their princely endowments, have been able to maintain against the passions and the prejudices which have left their mark upon the page of history in the four or five centuries which have elapsed since their foundation. No better testimony can be given to the value of endowments to keep up the reputation, and with the reputation the influence, the working power, the entire machinery of a school, than the relative extent to which the numbers of Eton and Harrow have fluctuated during the present generation. The numbers of Eton in 1862 were 840, of Harrow at the same date 481; each school being then on the full flood of prosperity. But in 1842, we find the numbers at Harrow 141, in 1844 still further diminished to 79, and in 1847 they had reached 314. In a period, that is to say, of three years, the school was just about quadrupled. Whereas since 1812 Eton has only twice fallen below 500, exhibiting these fluctuations during a period of thirty years—in 1823 being 627; in 1836, 444, the lowest in the century; in 1846, 777; and in 1852, 597; thus having never been down to half its present number. No doubt in the case of Harrow other and more direct causes can be assigned for the rapid changes it has undergone: but its rival under different conditions has been exposed to the same causes; and our inference is, that Eton, with an annual income of 20,000*l.* has been able, chiefly by means of its endowment, to counteract or to mitigate those disturbing forces to its numbers which Harrow, with only 1,000*l.* has been compelled to submit to.

In 1862, during the summer months of which the Commissioners paid their personal visits, there were 2,800 boys under tuition at the nine schools over which their authority extended: to which amount Eton, Harrow, Winchester, and Rugby contributed the 2,000. And if we consider the position which these 2,000 boys will take in the government of the country for the coming generation, it will not appear that the investigation which is being carried into every detail of their school life,

where the direction and the impetus is being given to the course of their life in the world, is either inquisitive or unpractical.

Passing from numbers to finance, we shall find that Eton maintains the same pre-eminence in the rewards it holds out to its staff of teachers and the payments it exacts from its pupils, as in the numbers it educates and the famous names which stand upon its roll; although in this last particular of expenditure Harrow treads closely upon it. The net income of the head master at Eton averages 4,500*l.* The gross receipts of Mr. Butler, at Harrow, are 10,000*l.*; but this sum is subjected to various deductions more or less voluntary, which bring it down to the level of the income of Mr. Balston. Winchester and Rugby are each worth 3,000*l.*, and Westminster 1,200*l.* The emoluments of an under-master vary of course with his standing. An assistant at Eton, with a moderate sized boarding-house, a position to which he can attain within two or three years of his appointment as master, earns upon an average 1,600*l.* a year; with the probability after some twenty-five years' service of being appointed a fellow of the college. It is stated, however, that a fellowship, valuable as it is, has not been an object of much competition, and that able men for the most part have not been willing to exchange for it the more lucrative post of a successful assistant-master. At Harrow and at Winchester the income of a master in the middle of the school seems to range at 800*l.* a year. The thirteen assistants which make up the classical staff of Dr. Temple at Rugby, obtain between them salaries amounting to 13,000*l.* a year; the highest being 1,600*l.* the lowest 340*l.* These stipends, high as they unquestionably are—for the majority of public schoolmasters are of an age at which men stand upon the lower steps of other liberal professions—seem essential to the well-being of the systems of which they form so material a part. For the qualifications of a successful master comprise not only high character and good scholarship, but many such personal aptitudes, like tact, judgment, determination, self-control, and good manners, which for the most part enable men to rise in the world. And unless the legitimate rewards of education were sufficiently large to attract men of this character from entering other professions, comparatively few of the able and gifted men who form the teaching staff of our public schools would be found devoting their lives to that calling.

A boy's expenses may, perhaps, be taken as a test of the social, though by no means of the educational, rank of his school. Judged by this, Eton and Harrow stand highest. A boy at Eton who learns French and mathematics costs his parents

annually 165*l.*; and this is exclusive of clothes, travelling, pocket-money, &c.; so that the gross expenses could not be laid at less than 200*l.* a year. At Harrow, with every outlay included, the cost of a boy at a large house is 165*l.* at a small one 205*l.*; the additional 40*l.* being supposed to purchase more personal supervision and more careful nurture than is practicable at a large house. It does not appear that the boy has more indulgences, except such as are adapted to his health and temperament, but the higher charge is held to be necessary for the remuneration of the masters to whom the small houses belong, and without a number of which a large and efficient staff could not be maintained at Harrow. It is no doubt desirable that a boy of delicate health should be able to come under the invigorating influence of the numbers of a public school, while at the same time he is exposed to the more individual superintendence which is only possible in a small establishment. But it is easy to see that the increase of these small houses for the maintenance of masters, on the plea that only a few could reap the benefit of larger ones, is liable to abuse. For, not to press the objection to the additional expense it devolves upon parents who would prefer to send their sons to one of the larger boarding houses, but for whom we believe there is often no opening, there is the graver objection that the system, the tone, the effects of small houses have a constant tendency to approximate to those of a private tutor's. There seems no remedy for this, unless the whole scheme of remuneration of masters were remodelled; we introduce it as an instance in which the absence of an endowment leads to a sacrifice of utility upon the altar of expediency. The charge for each boy in the head master's house at Winchester is 84*l.*; in the other boarding houses 105*l.*; the difference between the two houses going not directly into the pockets of the under masters, but being paid, together with some additional deductions, into a common fund, which is redistributed in the support of the staff of the school; so that adding some 30*l.* for clothes, &c., the maintenance of a boy at Winchester costs his parents 115*l.* a year in the head master's house, which in 1862 alone contained half the school, and 135*l.* in any one of the others. The expense of a boy in one of the two boarding houses at Westminster is 95*l.*; so that education there would amount to 125*l.* At Rugby, where the difference between lodging in the school house or elsewhere is very slight, the necessary expenditure for a boy's education, including a fair average for all incidental and personal outlay, is 120*l.* At Charterhouse it is much the same. And at Shrewsbury it does not average more than 100*l.* a year. In these estimates we have taken no account of collegers, scholars, foundationers, or



those boys who, under any other name, receive in any form pecuniary assistance from the revenues of the school.

It is not easy to ascertain what it is which regulates these various charges. They depend, no doubt, mainly upon the positive value of that which is received in return for them. But this will not altogether account for the great gap between the expenses of education at Eton and Shrewsbury—the former doubling the latter; especially if the success of the two schools at the Universities is to be taken as a criterion of the value of the instruction given at each. The sums charged to a boy's parents are to some extent a matter of custom, having a constant tendency to increase with the wealth of the country, and with the growing demand for the introduction of new subjects of instruction. The Commissioners could not refrain from several specific recommendations on the subject of charges: a matter in which they would have done wisely to have exercised more restraint. There is little risk of these great institutions descending to the level of commercial speculations; and here, as elsewhere, all questions of value and profit are best left to determine themselves. A school which rates its charges too high becomes the resort of a class, and that class a limited one, and ceases to be a public school, and is bad even for the rich men's sons whom without any other admixture it brings together; while one which, to increase its numbers and to extend its popularity, unduly lowers its scale, must do so at the sacrifice of efficiency, and must be content with a lower class of teachers on its staff.

The systems under which the boys are arranged for instruction prevailing at the different schools, vary, as might be expected, very widely; but no one of them seems to exhibit such marked superiority as to call for its general adoption. The advantages and disadvantages in a large school in this respect are tolerably evenly balanced. On the one side the influence of numbers acts as an incentive to an ambitious, energetic, and clever boy; the competition is more keen and the rewards of success more brilliant; the chances are greater that there will be more comrades of conspicuous talent against whom to contend; and the arena upon which the contest is waged is wider and more famous. But, on the other side, the very motives for exertion which spur the activity of an industrious boy, favour the weaknesses and increase the temptations of an idle, a listless, or a dull one. He moves on with the crowd—the majority will always be with him to support him in his idleness; and the divisions in a great school being either very large or very numerous, in the former case he escapes the eye of his master, in the latter he passes so rapidly from one master to another, that, even when detected, it is impossible to correct him. In a

large school, too, if a boy's energies turn strongly towards out-door games, the call made upon them is so great, and the field for their display so conspicuous, and the fame of success so attractive and conferring so much social influence and positive power, that the temptation to devote the best of them to cricket or boating, instead of Thucydides or Latin prose, is increased tenfold.

Authorities vary as to the highest number which a single master can control and teach in a class. The time during which he has the boys under his hand, their attainments, their industry, and their capacities, his own aptitude, his method of teaching, and other conditions, will, of course, affect the decision. There have been curious changes on this head, even within living memory. In Dr. Keate's time, one of the classes at Eton, and that one of the highest in the school, contained 200 boys; and the average through the school was 80. At present the number of boys heard in school together in one class, at Eton, averages 36; at Harrow, 34; at Winchester, owing to the practice of most of the masters taking two divisions, 45; at Rugby and at Shrewsbury, 33; and at Westminster, 23. The maximum which the Commissioners suggest should not be exceeded, is 30. And when it is considered that the whole time which is passed in schoolroom, taking one of the six days of the week with another, and making allowance for holidays, is, at Eton  $2\frac{1}{4}$  hours, at Harrow,  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , and at Rugby  $3\frac{1}{4}$  in the day, it will not be thought that the limit is fixed too low. The great difficulty which the large schools have to contend against is the excessive number of divisions, or as an alternative the excessive number of pupils in a division. The old traditional plan of six forms is supposed to be maintained in all cases, although practically in most only the sixth, fifth, and fourth survive. And to meet the large increase of recent years, and the modern requirements as to the limits of each class, it has been found necessary to break up these forms into an elaborate and, to an outsider, a most complicated system of divisions and removes. At Eton, for instance, the form between the fourth and fifth is called the remove, this is again divided into upper and lower remove; the fourth is divided into upper, middle, and lower removes; the fifth is arranged in three divisions, of which the two lower divisions are again sub-divided into removes: the whole scheme of classes and of promotion from one to another being made additionally involved by the word 'remove' bearing no less than four different meanings. At Harrow the term 'remove' is kept for the form below the fifth, which is not divided: below that comes the shell, and then the fourth form; all subordinate distributions being called divisions. At Winchester the forms are called

books, and the names of their divisions are somewhat complicated. It would require for example an effort to recollect at once a boy's exact position in the school, who is described as being at the top of the junior division of the middle part of the fifth book. At Rugby the classes in the middle part of the school have been arranged on the system of parallel forms; each division having a duplicate, which is doing the same work and holding the same position as itself.

These long series of classes are of course a necessity; and for a boy to rise in the school, it is equally necessary that he should pass through every one of them. To counteract the evils of the superficial acquaintance which each boy made with the master under whose charge he passed in his upward course, the great numbers which have long been collected at Eton gave birth to the well-known system of tutors, a system which at various dates and with various modifications has been transplanted both to Harrow and Rugby. The system, which is open to many objections, but which has very strong advocates, is this. When a man determines to send his son to Eton, he selects one of the tutors, all of whom are also masters, under whose charge to place him. Until lately a popular tutor might have as many as 100 pupils; now the number is limited to forty, and is practically rather less. The boy, as a rule, lodges and boards at his tutor's house; but whether he lives at one of the dames', or at a mathematical master's, the tutor has the boy's moral and intellectual training under his care, is directly responsible to, and is in constant correspondence with, his parents, cultivates a friendly and confidential relation with him, and as the boy is under his custody from the time he enters the school till the time he leaves it, he keeps a constant watch over his daily conduct and the unfolding of his character and his mind. In addition to this supervisional duty, the tutor assists his pupils in getting up their work before it is heard in class, every lesson being construed with him, and every exercise being corrected by him, previous to either coming before the master in class; besides which he does with all the boys in his house what is at Eton called 'private business,' and at Harrow, work 'with the tutor,' which consists in taking them through a certain quantity of reading, the subjects and the varieties of which are left very much to his own discretion; and for this purpose he arranges them in classes according to their attainments, capacities, and so forth, and punishes as much for neglect of private as of school work. Each tutor in fact holds, for private business, a school within a school. The advantages of this custom of previously construing and doing exercises are held to be these: each boy in all his work comes under two minds, and two minds

occupied, for the time being, upon the same subject, and so mutually put on their mettle; and it is thought that the blank hopelessness with which most boys first regard an involved and obscure passage in getting up a translation, is somewhat relieved by the presence of his tutor, to whom he does not hesitate to apply without any of that diffidence which would prevent him going up to a master, to whom he is comparatively strange; the tutor too has better opportunities of observing and estimating his pupil's progress, being able to watch his advance through his whole school career, and to compare him throughout, not only with boys supposed to be of his ability, but with boys of all ages and capacities: the system has the further advantage of making the masters' work more varied, and obliging even the lowest to keep up with the instruction given at the top of the school. But, as a set-off to this, it is objected that it wastes the masters' time, by giving two men the work which one might compass, or rather by setting men to do in two capacities that which they might accomplish in one. And there is the further and more serious objection, that the boy is not left sufficiently to his own resources. At Harrow the practice of construing with the tutor previously to going into school, is evidently falling into disuse. The first six divisions in the school are altogether exempt from it; while at Eton only the two highest escape. It is a custom which requires very great caution in its exercise, for it is as easy to over-encourage as to discourage; there is the temptation to confuse the want of capacity with the want of application and industry; and the boy is liable to fall into the habit of depending upon others to work out his difficulties, instead of falling back upon his own powers; a habit, when his tutor is not at hand, which is sure to take refuge in cribs and other illicit assistance. At Westminster the system of private tutors, though flourishing at one period, is at present totally extinct. At Winchester it is still in its infancy, there being a custom of old standing that each of the ten senior boys should have some of the juniors assigned to him as pupils, and his duty is to look over the exercises of the juniors before they are shown up, to help them in preparing lessons whenever they want help, and in a general way to see that they are industrious and well-conducted. This custom, which the present excellent head master would wish to keep in full force, has been of late years considerably infringed upon by the appointment of composition masters, who take no class in school, but whose main employment seems to lie in correcting the exercises and compositions of the boys. But in its full development, the tutorial system is not at present one of the characteristics of Winchester.

No doubt the advantages which a boy receives from private tuition, if the tutor at all rises to his opportunities, are very valuable. We can conceive nothing better calculated for fostering a taste for study and for general reading, or for giving method to the desultory courses into which such tastes in youth frequently stray where they already exist. Nor do we see why the plan which many tutors have, of departing widely from the line of instruction given in school, should not be still further developed. The time spent in class at Eton is almost, if not quite, exclusively devoted to Latin and Greek, taught in text-books which for the most part are few in number, chiefly extracts from original works, and confined in matter and language within very narrow limits. What is deficient in the school course, private reading with the tutor supplements; but why should it not go beyond this, and supply, not only occasionally, as in some instances is already the case, a little French or modern history, but be made a recognised vehicle for introducing all those special subjects for which there is so loud an outcry, and leave the old classical instruction in undisputed possession of school hours? Tutors might find difficulty in acquiring such varied knowledge as would be needed, without invading the time and the ability given to their classical attainments; but they need not be insuperable, particularly if such instruction were made, as all school instruction for the common run of boys ought to be, elementary and introductory. Most men so highly educated as the majority of public school masters could teach the grammar and dictionary of French, or the outlines of natural science, without any very great mental effort; and means might be provided for securing the attendance of competent foreigners or professed scientific men, to assist the few more advanced scholars who would need their help. The cases will be few in which modern languages will be pursued with any avidity during boyhood, but when such cases do occur, they are legitimate and praiseworthy tastes which ought to be gratified. It is well to control, but it is unwise to check the direction in which any young mind may branch out in its yearning after knowledge. To the vast majority of boys, a good drilling in the elements of French, in the vocabulary, the grammar, and the simpler rules of pronunciation, is all which is required or which can be attained; the elegancies of idiom and the purity of pronunciation are far more effectively learnt a little later in life by a sojourn in the countries where each language is living and is spoken. Scarcely any boy masters, or even reaches to a fair idiomatic acquaintance with his own language; fewer still become, while yet at school, elegant or sound scholars in Latin or Greek; and it is unreasonable to expect a refined, critical appreciation of the French tongue, at a

time of life when none such exists of the mother tongue. Still, no boy ought to pass through school without being set up with such a framework of one, at least, of the continental languages as would enable him afterwards, if he has the opportunity, the inclination, and the energy, to fill it up with an accurate and full knowledge of the language. It is not only that the difficulty of getting classical masters with a scholarly knowledge of modern languages, or of getting foreign masters with the power of maintaining the discipline of an English school, is a bar to anything further than this; but there is fair ground for doubting whether more would be desirable,—whether an inroad would not necessarily be made upon the liberal, general, and solid education of public schools for the sake of what is professional, or special, or ornamental,—whether too great a sacrifice of severe systematic mental training would not be made to a social and gentlemanly accomplishment. The advantages of classics as the groundwork of upper-class education seem to be so preponderating, that if modern tongues could only be taught by appropriating some material part of the time given to Latin and Greek, we should advocate a total neglect of the moderns in preference to a partial neglect of the ancients. But we do not think the case limited to such an alternative.

There seems no danger from the subjoined evidence of Mr. Balston, that the teaching of modern languages at Eton is likely to supersede or interfere with the old traditionary teaching of the school:—

‘Lord Clarendon. Would it not be considered necessary by the authorities of Eton to render obligatory a thing which they think ought to be part of an English gentleman’s education? I should not.

‘You would not consider it necessary to devote any part of the school time to its acquisition? No, not a day.

‘You do not intend to do so? No.

‘Do you not think that it is a matter which a boy should be required to learn? He ought to learn French before he came to Eton, and we would take measures to keep it up, as we keep up English.

‘What measures would you take to keep up French, and I may also add, what measures do you now take to keep up English at Eton? There are none at present, except through the ancient languages.

‘Sir S. Northcote. You do not think it is satisfactory? No; the English teaching is not satisfactory, and as a question of precedence, I should have English taught before French.

‘You do not consider that English is taught at present? No.’

It cannot be borne too closely in mind that the true purpose of a public school is not to form a few clever boys and turn out periodically a few great scholars, but to supply an education to every boy who offers himself, and who is not incapacitated mentally or morally; to supply to each one the best education which the age requires and he is capable of receiving. Now while



the school theoretically sets before itself the end of raising its pupils to the highest intellectual pitch which their minds will bear, and with this view keeps the whole machinery of teaching in the highest perfection, and employs teachers of the highest order, in practice the results do, and always will, fall far short of these intentions. And while on the one hand any attempt to lower the standard to the level not of good, but of ordinary capacities, would be a great evil; it would be an evil of scarcely less magnitude to make the distance between the scheme of education, and the mental powers and the actual industry of the boys so educated, wide and palpable. Let the boy by all means have the best education, but let its excellence consist in its perfect adaptation to his capacity, and, as far as practicable, to his future life.

If a more comprehensive system than at present prevails is sought to be introduced, its introduction can be justified only on the supposition, either that part of the existing narrow system would be better displaced by other studies; or that the powers of work which average boys possess are now underrated, and that they will bear a stronger educational pressure than now is put upon them. The first of these grounds on which a revision could be defended, opens the whole question of the disciplinary and literary value of the classics, as compared with what are vaguely called modern subjects; a question which we have no intention to discuss at present. We shall content ourselves with extracting a verdict in favour of the two dead languages from the report of the Commissioners:—

‘We are convinced that the best materials available to Englishmen for school studies are furnished by the language and literature of Greece and Rome. From the regular structure of these languages, from their logical accuracy of expression, from the comparative ease with which their etymology is traced and reduced to general laws, from their severe canons of taste and style, from the very fact that they are “dead,” and have been handed down to us directly from the periods of their highest perfection, practically untouched by the inevitable process of degeneration and decay; they are, beyond all doubt, the finest and most serviceable models we have for the study of language. As literature they supply the most graceful and some of the noblest poetry, the finest eloquence, the deepest philosophy, the wisest historical writing; and these excellencies are such as to be appreciated keenly, though inadequately, by young minds, and to leave, as in fact they do, a lasting impression. Besides this, it is at least a reasonable opinion that this literature has had a powerful effect in moulding and animating the statesmanship and political life of England. Nor is it to be forgotten that the whole civilization of modern Europe is really built upon the foundations laid two thousand years ago by two highly civilized nations on the shores of the Mediterranean; that their languages supply the key to our modern tongues; their poetry, history, philosophy, and law, to the poetry and history, the philosophy and jurisprudence of modern times; that this key can seldom be acquired except in youth, and that the possession of it, as daily experience proves, and as those who have it not will most readily acknowledge, is very far from being a mere literary advantage.’—*First Part, General Report*, p. 28.

So that taking it for granted that Latin and Greek hold and ought to hold, both by prescription and by right, the supreme place in the course of public school education, the second alternative which alone could justify the insertion of new subjects, is that boys can be made to learn more than is now the case. That they might and ought to learn more, that any individual boy, of average capacity, picked out and enticed and spurred into exertion would learn more, there can be no doubt. But whether boys as a body will be induced to learn more by the simple expedient of giving them more to learn, is another matter. It may safely be assumed that with the common run of boys it requires a pretty strong effort to bestow thought or application upon anything in the way of a lesson. The process of learning is irksome and laborious; and immediately a subject is made so attractive as to need little or no effort, it loses one half, at least, of its educational value. So that supposing the classical language which most boys are set up with at the time of their leaving school to be meagre in quantity and poor in quality, what can be expected to be the results of the attention and industry given to additional studies, while that given to classics remains undiminished? At Harrow there appears to be an opinion that the application given to modern subjects has not lessened that given to the old languages; but the experience is yet so short, and the evidence so conflicting, that little reliance can be put upon the opinion. The Commissioners are sanguine enough to hope that the chance of variety which the infusion of new studies would afford, would go far towards driving away that great enemy of all schoolmasters—idleness. Much time spent in school is no doubt utterly wasted; many topics which occupy a boy's mind are no doubt frivolous or mischievous; so they think that, without infringing either upon the time devoted to the old established studies, or to play, they can counteract this waste, and supply rational subjects of thought by rendering compulsory a study of French and German, or Italian, natural science, music or drawing, modern history, and English composition. And it is expected that after four or five years of school, nine boys out of every ten will have a fair critical knowledge of the language and the subject-matter of all good Latin and Greek authors; will be able to speak French fluently and purely, and read German intelligently; will have mastered the outlines of chemistry, geology, and natural history; will have cultivated the hand, ear, and voice; will be tolerably well read in history, and faultless in geography; will have attained some power of writing in good sound grammatical English: while the tenth boy will have excelled in all these attainments together.

The Commissioners have gathered from the evidence brought before them, although it is evidence with many exceptions, that boys who have excelled in classics excel also in mathematics and modern languages. But this proves no more than that a youth of good ability can turn his talents in two or three directions, without failing in any one. Boys, however, of good ability are exceptions in a public school. The average boy has only average capacity, and makes only a partial use of what he has. Large schools already favour cleverness too much, and leave the idle to their idleness, and the dull to their dullness. This arises partly from temptations and defects inherent in large numbers, and partly from the natural and unconquerable inclination of tutors and masters to bestow pains where they see their pains bear the greatest results. And it is impossible to banish the fear that if modern subjects are to be made compulsory to any marked extent—and the scale suggested devotes nine-twentieths of the class hours of the week to them—a boy who shows special aptitude for any one of these—who can talk French fluently, but construes Latin slovenly, has the gift of quoting Shakespeare and of forgetting Sophocles or Homer, has a passion for wild flowers, but is cold and dead to grammar, has a scientific ear for music, but none at all for iambics—will gradually be allowed to follow his own tastes, and neglect altogether his aversions and his difficulties. The result of which would be, in the case of clever boys with such inclinations, that their minds would be stored with information and be barren of knowledge, that they would be accomplished but not educated or instructed, and that they would have picked up many acquirements, but undergone no discipline and no wholesome effort in acquiring them. While the common run of boys would no doubt gladly hail some change from construing and verses; but applying themselves no more thoroughly to new learning than to old, their minds would be overloaded with a multitude of subjects without receiving benefit from one, their observation, already vagrant, would be distracted, their thoughts, already loose, would be dissipated; and instead of preparing themselves in some fashion to gather information in after life as occasions or needs arise, they would be contenting themselves with scraps and undigested facts, which possess no solid nourishing properties to strengthen the mental constitution. No doubt French is a desirable and perhaps necessary part of a gentleman's education; no doubt an acquaintance with scientific laws quickens the faculty of observation and calls out the reasoning powers—though we doubt whether science itself, so called, is adapted to the early stages of the mind's development; no doubt a knowledge of the practice of music

and drawing is gratifying to the possessor, though, unless combined with some artistic taste, it gratifies no one else; but all these, so pleasant to possess, so easy comparatively to acquire, are dearly purchased if there is to be given up for them that sound training and discipline of a boy's mind, which would enable him to fulfil all the duties, and to clothe himself in as many as need be of the graces of life in the world. We do not see how, unless such studies are strictly kept subsidiary and in the background, the conclusion is to be avoided, that a boy's inclination is to be made the measure and the criterion of what he ought to learn, not the experience and the observation of his masters. Except by private tuition, and in the way of additional work, a public school, in our opinion, should not allow any one of these studies to invade the supremacy of classics: an opinion which is fortified by the experience of Mr. Butler, at Harrow:—'I have always felt,' he says, 'that if I was a private tutor in the country, having a few pupils, supposing I was equally competent to teach all those different branches, I should be guided mainly by the peculiar character of the boy's intellect, and should not at all think myself bound to adhere to any one particular system; but when you have to administer instruction to a very large number of boys, you must keep very strictly to the routine of one particular system, though you know all the while that you are, to a certain extent, sacrificing the intellectual advance of some one or more particular boys.' The Commissioners are alive to these various objections which bear upon their suggestions on this head, but do not allow them the weight which we think they ought to carry with them. There are two fallacies which underlie the grounds on which they base their recommendations: one, that boys will do all that they ought to do; the other, that by striking a mean between the capacities of the highest and lowest, a measure is got of the actual power of all the boys in the school, while, in fact, the real capacity lies far below the average capacity.

There is little difficulty in pointing out theoretical deficiencies in public school education; still less in pointing out inadequate and meagre results. The Commissioners wished to try each school by a direct examination, a project which would certainly have caused jealousy and soreness, and which was wisely resisted by the masters. Failing this, they had no other resource for comparing the means of instruction employed with the end gained, than by examining University class lists for the results in the cases of scholarships, ability, and industry, and University tutors for the results in the case of the common run of boys. Such a criterion is necessarily defective; for while academical honours and prizes are a fair test of the higher results of school educa-

tion, the majority of boys sedulously avoid every test which can be avoided, and thus, so far as any judgment is formed from their performances upon the course which they had gone through previous to entering college, it rests not upon fact but upon opinion. And it must be further borne in mind that the Universities receive only a portion, and the army the smallest fraction, of boys educated at public schools. About one-third of the whole number go up to Oxford or Cambridge, and only some forty a year are candidates for direct commissions at Woolwich, so that there are no means whatever of bringing a strict and positive test to bear upon the value of the instruction which the other two-thirds have received. College tutors agree that the best and the worst men are sent up to them from the public schools; they agree too that the schools turn out accomplished men and fine scholars; but they complain with an unfortunate unanimity that the majority of undergraduates entering direct from Eton, Harrow, Westminster, and the rest, come up ignorant and unprepared, 'men who have been allowed 'as boys to carry their idleness with them from form to form, 'and to work below their powers,' and whom it is too late to make anything of. At good colleges something like one-third are 'plucked' at matriculation, unless they have been previously 'coached,' nearly a fourth submit to the same fate at Responsions. The Commissioners have accumulated a mass of evidence and statistics with regard to men who do not read for honours, and are obliged to confess that their 'facts and figures' 'do not indicate an average of classical attainments which can 'by any stretch of indulgence be deemed satisfactory.' How far the schools themselves are responsible for this, how far the blame is to be shared by parents and by the preparatory schools in which boys profess to be grounded, we are not prepared to decide.

But it is not in class lists nor in the note-books of examiners that the grand result of English public school education is to be looked for. We must not go to the Universities alone to see what they have done for us, but to the halls and the rectories, the society, the Church, the state, the history of England. Whatever manliness of character, whatever capacity of self-government, whatever healthy independence, whatever public spirit Englishmen pride themselves upon, they have had more than their share of forming, of teaching their pupils to be not only accomplished scholars, but to bear without reproach 'the grand old name of gentleman.'

- ART. VIII.—1. *Jerusalem Explored; being a Description of the Ancient and Modern City, with numerous Illustrations, &c. &c.* By ERMETE PIEROTTI, Doctor in Mathematics, &c. &c. Translated by THOMAS GEORGE BONNEY, M.A. 2 Vols. folio. London and Cambridge. 1864.
2. *Le Temple de Jérusalem. Monographie du Haram-ech-chérif. Suivie d'un Essai sur la Topographie de la Ville Sainte.* Par LE COMTE MELCHIOR DE VOGÜÉ. Paris, Londres, Liège: Livraisons I, II, III. 1864.
3. *The Siege of Jerusalem by Titus: with a Journal of a recent Visit to the Holy City.* By THOMAS LEWIN, Esq. London. 1863.
4. *Dr. Pierotti and his Assailants; or, A Defence of 'Jerusalem Explored.'* By the REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D. With an Appendix of Documents. London. 1864.
5. *The Holy Places at Jerusalem; or, Fergusson's Theories and Pierotti's Discoveries.* By T. G. BONNEY, M.A. London. 1864.
6. *Golgatha og Christi Grav.* Af P. W. BECKER. Kjobenhavn (Denmark). 1864.

NOTWITHSTANDING all that has been done of late years for the geography and archæology of Syria and Palestine, by such exhaustive explorers as Drs. Robinson, Eli Smith, and Thompson, by Van der Velde, Porter, Miss Beaufort, Dean Stanley, and others, it is quite clear from the advertisements of recent publications, and still more from those which are announced as in the press or preparing for publication, that the subject is far indeed from having lost its interest, and that this field of research has ever new treasures with which to reward the toils and perils of the increasing band of investigators.

It is a special subject of congratulation to Biblical students, that the geology and natural history of Palestine, in which scarcely anything has been attempted for very many years, have been at length taken up and prosecuted by persons competent before all others to do justice to them. Mr. Tristram, the well-known naturalist, has already given us a foretaste of the pleasure which we may anticipate from the publication of his work, in the lively extracts from his Journal already published in the last volume of 'Long Vacation Tourists.' It is a great satisfaction to know that his researches have resulted in many and important additions to the Fauna and Flora of Palestine; that his piscatory recreations in the Sea of Tiberias have brought up from the



depths of that sacred lake new specimens of fish, of the existence of which in those waters no naturalist before had any conception; and that his double-barrel has brought down from the heights of Hermon ornithological rarities, whose *habitat* was supposed to be confined to the Arctic regions. We await with eager interest Mr. Tristram's promised contribution to this most important department of Biblical study.

Still more rich in promise are the results of the important expedition, from which the Duke of Luynes has quite lately returned, after a most successful prosecution of well-considered researches in a field which has hitherto baffled the enterprise of English, French, and Americans alike. This nobleman, already well known to Oriental scholars for his diligent and successful prosecution of Phœnician studies, and particularly by the publication of the great inscription on the sarcophagus of the Sidonian king Esmunazar, now in the Louvre at Paris, after a long and careful preparation commensurate with the importance of his undertaking, has during the current year conducted a party of explorers to the East, where no pains or expense were spared to realize results worthy of the enterprise. An iron boat, constructed at Toulon expressly for the navigation of the Dead Sea, and successfully launched on its heavy waters, has compelled that reluctant lake to reveal its long hidden secrets, which English, Irish, and American sailors had before investigated at no less a penalty than their lives. It is, indeed, a subject of great gratification that this deadly sea, after exacting three victims—Lieutenants Costegan and Molyneux, of our royal navy, and Lieutenant Dale, attached to the American exploring expedition of Captain Lynch—has, however grudgingly, surrendered at discretion to the indomitable perseverance of European science. Twenty-seven days' sailing, without the slightest difficulty, on these hitherto mysterious waters, not much larger in extent than some of our English lakes, while it will serve to check, and, if necessary, to rectify, the surveys of Molyneux and Lynch, will probably leave nothing to be added to our knowledge; while it may be hoped that the considerate liberality of the Duke in presenting his boat, when it had served his purpose, to the Arab inhabitants of the shores of the lake, will enable enterprising travellers, at least for some few years to come, to verify for themselves the accuracy of his observations.

But the Duke of Luynes has not confined his attentions to the Sea of Lot, as it is styled by the natives. The great crevasse of the Ghor, as the Jordan valley is called, and of Wady Araba, between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akaba, have been thoroughly surveyed; Kerak, Machærus, Arak-el-Emir (of

which more presently), and Jerash have been explored; as has also the country of Edom, including Petra, for so many past years closed to travellers by the feuds of the Arab tribes in the vicinity. In all these regions, not only have geological surveys and hydrographical observations been made with the utmost care, but all have been laid down with the nicest accuracy (and the appliances of photography have not been neglected), so as to furnish the elements for an accurate atlas of a country which had heretofore been only skimmed by travellers, whose hasty passage through the dangerous and inhospitable region afforded neither time nor opportunity for a scientific examination. Finally, on the Duke's return to France, the officer of the Imperial navy who accompanied his expedition remained behind to make a careful survey of Palmyra, where he has taken photographs of all the most important objects, and determined the exact position of the city by a series of astronomical observations. We sincerely congratulate the Duke on his safe return, and tender him our hearty thanks for his eminent services to the great cause which we all have at heart; and we trust that in no long time we shall be able to announce that Sacred Literature has been enriched by the publication of his work.

With little less impatience do we await the new volume of travels by the author of '*Le Voyage autour de la Mer Morte*,' which is to contain the account of his recent excavations at Jerusalem and beyond Jordan, at Arak-el-Emir, and other newly explored sites on the borders of the country of Moab. All that proceeds from the pen of M. de Sauley is worth reading; and even when his arguments fail to carry conviction, they serve, at least, to confirm our confidence in his industry and honesty; and our admiration for the zeal and ability with which he advocates his somewhat startling theories, disposes us to deal leniently with his too lively imagination, the deductions from which will not, perhaps, always bear the test of rigid criticism. He has set himself a hard task if, as we hear, he is undertaking to prove that the contemporaneous inscription on the coffin-lid which he discovered in the Tombs of the Kings assigns it to the wife of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and so proves the square Hebrew character to be anterior to the Babylonish captivity; or that the monuments about Jerusalem, which bear unmistakable traces of an acquaintance with the classical forms of architecture, date back to the era of Solomon. We can safely leave these interesting subjects in his hands, with the conviction that he will do all that can be done for the vindication of his interesting and ingenious theories.

Most important of all, in an archæological view, are the recent researches in Palestine, the Hauran, and Central Syria,

of the Count de Vogüé and his companion Mr. Waddington, an instalment of which is now before us in the magnificent work on the Temple of Jerusalem, the title of which stands at the head of this article. All who are interested in these studies are fully aware that the Count de Vogüé is no tyro in this field of investigation. His beautiful book, entitled '*Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte*,' was the first to bring into prominent notice many still existing remains of pointed architecture, erected by the piety of the Crusading Franks during their brief occupation of the country in the twelfth century, most important for their bearing on the history of Gothic architecture in the West, serving as they do to illustrate and exemplify the influence exercised by the Saracens upon the Christian architecture of Europe, and to supply a missing link in the chain of architectural history.

We cannot resist the temptation to dwell for a few minutes on his important excursions in 1862, if only to prepare the reader for the treat which is in store for him, when the results of these most successful researches in Eastern and Central Syria shall be presented to the world in the dress in which two most able and conscientious antiquaries will be sure to clothe them, accompanied with some two thousand inscriptions, hitherto unedited, revealing the history of two new worlds in the zenith of their civilization.

Mr. Porter and Mr. Cyril Graham have given us some idea of the extent of the field which they could only partially explore; and Dr. Wetzstein, the Prussian Consul at Damascus, has prosecuted his researches still further eastward of the Hauran, in the districts of Safa and Jebel-Ses, of the very existence of which we have only recently been informed. But the descriptions of these travellers had not prepared us for such a rich harvest as Count de Vogüé and Mr. Waddington have now brought back in their portfolios and note-books, with the examination of which we have been favoured; and we question whether the history of civilization contains a page so curious and interesting as that which has yet to be written from the inscribed monuments of Auranitis and its adjacent provinces.

'In fact, the Greek inscriptions of the Hauran present us with a complete history of the country since it has had a history, i.e. since the accession of King Agrippa. The earliest inscription shows us the new sovereign reproaching the inhabitants with their savage life, comparing their manners and their habitations to those of wild beasts, and calling them for the first time to civilization. Some years later, these same people were building temples, erecting statues, and engraving inscriptions in honour of their benefactor. Then came the

'Roman Empire, represented by many hundreds of inscriptions which contain valuable details concerning the organization of the provinces, the military forces, the Arab tribes. With the fourth century commences the series of Christian inscriptions, which conduct us to the eighth century, and furnish us with the names of bishops, information concerning the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the worship of saints, chronology. In this last series are found many inscriptions relative to the Gassanite kings, whose names appear for the first time in some Greek inscriptions.'

Still more startling are the revelations from Central Syria, for which we are also indebted to these enterprising travellers; because, lying so much nearer to the beaten track of Eastern travel, and being much more accessible than the parts of which we have just spoken, it is strange that they should have been so long overlooked, particularly as Pocock had indicated, however briefly, the existence of ruined churches and monasteries in that district. But as to the extent of these monuments of Christian antiquity, and their perfect preservation, we had no indications from any previous writers.

The following graphic description refers to a mountain district lying between Antioch, Aleppo, and Apameia, on the right bank of the Orontes, the several parts of which are known in the country by the names of Jebel Riha, Jebel Ala, Jebel Alaka, and Jebel Semaân, the last of which derives its name from the magnificent church dedicated to S. Simon Stilites, briefly described by Pocock, in his 'Description of the East,' a beautiful drawing of which was exhibited by Count de Vogüé, last year, in the *Architectural Exposition*, of Paris. Writing of this district the Count says:—

'I do not believe that there exists in all Syria a collection which can bear comparison with that presented by the ruins of these countries. I am almost tempted to refuse the name of ruins to a series of towns almost intact, or, at least, of which all the elements remain, sometimes overthrown, never dispersed, the sight of which transports the traveller to the midst of a lost civilization, and reveals to him, so to speak, all its secrets. In passing through these deserted streets, these forsaken courts, these porticos where the vine entwines itself round mutilated columns, we experience sensations analogous to those which are felt more strongly at Pompeii—for the climate of Syria has not preserved its treasures so well as the cinders of Vesuvius—but more freshly here, for the civilization which we here contemplate is less known than that of the Augustan age. In fact, all these cities, which are more than a hundred and fifty in number, within a space of thirty or forty

'leagues, form a whole, from which it is impossible to detach any part; where all is tied and chained together; belonging to the same style, to the same system—in short, to the same epoch, and that the epoch of primitive Christianity, hitherto the most unknown in an artistic point of view; extending from the fourth to the seventh century of our era. We are here transported into the midst of a Christian society, and discover its manner of life: not a life hid in catacombs, not, as has been commonly imagined, a degraded, timid, suffering state of existence, but a life of freedom and opulence, addicted to the arts; in large houses built with huge blocks of dressed stone, perfectly arranged, furnished with their covered galleries and balconies, beautiful gardens planted with vines; with wine-presses, cellars, and stone casks; with large subterranean kitchens, and stables for horses, in courts surrounded with cloisters; elegant baths; magnificent churches supported by columns, flanked by towers, encompassed by splendid tombs. Crosses and monograms of Christ are sculptured in relief on most of the gates, and numerous inscriptions may be read on the monuments; in which, however—from a sentiment of Christian humility, which forms a remarkable contrast with the vain-glorious display of pagan inscriptions—are to be found no proper names of individuals; only pious sentences, passages of Scripture, monograms, and dates. But the tenor of these inscriptions points to an epoch closely following the triumph of the Church. . . . By one of those phenomena, of which the East offers frequent examples, all these Christian towns were abandoned on the same day, probably at the time of the Musulman invasion; and since that time they have remained untouched. But for the earthquakes, which have thrown down many of the walls and columns, nothing would be wanting but the timber and wood-work of the houses.'

It is a subject of very sincere congratulation to the lovers of Christian art that these copious materials for the history of the ecclesiastical and domestic architecture of Syria in the palmy days of the Church of Antioch, should have fallen into the hands of archæologists competent before all others to do full justice to so important a subject.

If we have been beguiled by this very seductive theme into a fuller account of the recent discoveries in Central and Eastern Syria than we had contemplated, it will be found that they have an important bearing on that which was to have formed the principal subject of this paper, and to which we shall now endeavour to confine ourselves—viz. the progress of archæological and architectural discovery at Jerusalem since our last notice, in June, 1862

In resuming this discussion, it is very far from our intention to enter at any length upon those topographical and historical inquiries which have occupied us in times past. One remarkable result of the investigations of archaeologists in this field of research—which cannot but be most flattering to their self-respect—is this: that however widely their theories differ, however diametrically they may be opposed, one and all are sure to claim every fresh discovery as confirmatory of his particular view. Thus, *e.g.* M. de Sauley has returned from his recent visit, we are informed, more convinced than ever of the soundness of his startling hypotheses, more satisfied than before that his identification of the Tombs of the Kings with the Sepulchres of the Kings of Judah in the City of David, is the only tenable theory. Mr. Fergusson, again, who has quite lately returned from his first visit, writing to the *Times* on the Mosk at Hebron, avails himself of that opportunity to proclaim to the world that, after an exhaustive examination of the localities at Jerusalem, he has ‘come back more confirmed than before in the correctness of all he has written or said with regard to the Holy Places;’ which, considering what he has said and written, certainly implies a strength of conviction which it would be equally difficult to measure in thought or to describe in language. For ourselves, we must admit that the study of two of the most important works which have lately appeared on the subject of Jerusalem topography has obliged us to modify our previous views to some considerable extent, and we shall confine ourselves in this paper chiefly to those points which we think have been established beyond all reasonable question by Count de Vogüé and Signor Pierotti, whether they agreed with our preconceived notions or not.

In proceeding to ‘Jerusalem Explored,’ it is impossible to ignore the curious literary controversy to which its publication gave rise, and which, for a time, occupied a very considerable space in the columns of the *Times*. Not that we are going to discuss the merits of the points at issue between ‘Dr. Pierotti and his assailants,’ Messrs. Fergusson and Grove. The necessity of doing so is in great measure superseded by the pamphlet which bears that title, with the conclusions of which we should be glad to acquiesce, did not the possession of further evidence, not within reach of the author of that pamphlet at the time of his writing it, force upon us the conviction that Dr. Pierotti has appropriated the labours of others, particularly of Mr. Catherwood, to a much larger extent than is admitted by himself or his champion. We deeply regret the necessity we are under to make this avowal; for we are fully sensible of the obligations we owe to Signor Pierotti for the patient and persevering efforts



which he made, during a residence of eight years in Jerusalem, to illustrate its topography and history; and the use which we shall forthwith proceed to make of his great work will prove how highly we estimate it. But this only leads us to regret the more that from some fatality—for we cannot adopt the theory of a lack either of opportunity or ability—he should, in the first instance, have laid himself open to the charge of plagiarism, and then have lacked the moral courage to acknowledge the full extent of his obligations to his predecessors.

The most important facts established by Signor Pierotti's topographical surveys, are: first, the confirmation of the views of former explorers as to the course of the first or old wall along the northern brow of Sion, and the commencement of the second wall near the Gate Gennath; secondly, the entirely new line which he ascribes to the third wall, or that of Agrippa; and thirdly, the arrangement of the Temple and its courts, which results from his most important subterranean discoveries in and about the area of the Temple. We shall say something on each of these points, chiefly in the language of our author; on which we may, by the way, compliment the translator, as having performed a difficult task in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, rendering the original Italian into vigorous and perfectly idiomatic English, so as effectually to disguise from the reader that he is reading a translation; no small praise when so much of the terminology was necessarily technical, and consequently demanded an amount of professional knowledge which one would have had no right antecedently to expect in a clerical Fellow of a College in Cambridge.

1. In identifying the towers of the modern Castle of David with those of Hippicus, Phasaelus and Mariamne, Signor Pierotti does but accept an hypothesis generally acquiesced in by archaeologists, since it was first published in '*The Holy City*,' some twenty years ago. His attempts to discover traces of the old wall of Sion along the line of David Street, which runs eastward from the Jaffa Gate to the Bazaar, were not altogether successful; but happily, since he quitted Jerusalem, an English traveller has supplied the chain of evidence which was wanting to place this question beyond all controversy. Part of the wall, with its flanking towers, has been actually seen and measured and plotted by Mr. Lewin. The following description relates to a spot on the northern brow of Sion, west of the entrance to the Bazaar from David Street.

'In excavating what he called "the cliff of Sion," that is, the part next to and on the north of Kanâter Mar Botrûs, they came to a cistern lined with cement; but on further clearance, it was found that what had anciently been used as a cistern had, in still more remote times, been a tower, measuring in the

interior eight feet from north to south, and nine feet from east to west, and on the west side was a gateway five feet wide, with a round arch at the height of eighteen feet from the floor of the tower. The whole depth of the floor from the level of the street above was thirty-six feet. At the distance of sixty-four feet to the east was found another tower which corresponded, with the exception that it had no gateway, but projecting stones in the interior as if for supporting a staircase. Between the two towers, and on the south of them, ran a massive wall. I examined the wall, and it consisted of large stones, but not at all equal in size to those at the corners of the Haram, and not bevelled. What was the thickness of the wall I do not recollect to have heard, but it must have been very considerable, for Mr. Schick, finding no other foundation, proceeded to build the wall of the house upon it. This led to a contest between the architect and the civic authorities, for this old wall, instead of taking exactly the line of the street, projected a few feet southward into it, so that the thoroughfare would be proportionately curtailed by carrying the new wall along the same line. However, the want of any other solid foundation was strongly urged, and eventually the new wall was allowed to rest on the back of the old one. To the north of the towers the ground was excavated to a depth of ten feet more, but no rock appeared, but "only very small stones, looking like the filling up of a trench." Here, then, we seem to have the old first wall of Sion flanked with towers sixty-four feet apart, and overhanging the Tyropœon valley on the north. Mr. Schick has no classical knowledge, and is perfectly innocent of Josephus, and his words that the valley was filled up with "only very small stones, looking like the filling up of a trench," are very remarkable, as the Jewish historian particularly mentions that when Titus had taken the first and second walls, he cast up two mounds against the upper city, one by the Pool of Hezekiah, then called the Almond Pool, and the other at the distance from the first of thirty cubits, or forty-five feet; and if, as is likely, the second mound was forty-five to the east of the other, its position would coincide with the part of the valley where these "small stones," as if "for the filling up of a trench," were noticed by Mr. Schick. At first sight it may appear singular that if this was the Wall of Sion the gate of the tower should turn toward the west, but a little reflection will furnish the explanation. To the north of the wall was a deep valley, and no direct approach was practicable. The road, therefore, was brought up the valley in a slanting direction, and so came to the side of the tower, and the west side was chosen as the most convenient for the traffic along the thoroughfare now occupied by the Jaffa Gate.—*Lewin*, pp. 216—218.

Of the course of the second wall, which ran from the Gate Gennath northward, Signor Pierotti has discovered other traces besides those pointed out by Mr. Williams and Dr. Schultz, the former of whom was the first to propose, as the latter immediately accepted, that hypothesis for which Signor Pierotti, Count de Vogüé, and Mr. Lewin now adduce additional evidence.

Having described the round-headed arch at the western entrance to the Bazaar, Signor Pierotti thus proceeds:—

"In the immediate neighbourhood of the tower Hippicus, I was not able to find any ancient remains, and therefore suppose that the wall commenced at this gate. I sought for its ruins, along a line northwards from this point, but was at first unsuccessful, although I found a fragment of a building on the east side of the plot of land formerly occupied by the convent of S. Mary the Great, which may possibly belong to an early period; but I had afterwards three opportunities of learning that I was not mistaken, in expecting to find the required evidence somewhere in this part. 1. In January, 1857, the weight of

a quantity of fallen snow threw down a part of the wall of a Mohammedan bazaar, called the Meat Bazaar, near the above-named convent. By order of the Governor I repaired it in 1858, and in digging down to the rock to lay the new foundations at a depth of ten feet below the surface, came upon large stones, boldly rusticated, and arranged in a manner that reminded me of the Phœnician work of the time of Solomon. This wall is nine feet thick, and consists of three courses of stone,—the first, which lies on the rock, being  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet in height, the second 2, and the third  $2\frac{1}{2}$ ; thus an extension both north and south was proved by this fragment. 2. In 1858 the Russian mission at Jerusalem, by my suggestion, obtained a piece of land near to the Church of the Resurrection, on the east. In 1859 they cleared away the accumulated rubbish, and during the work the corner of a Jewish wall was discovered, the stones of which were rusticated to a depth of 4 or 5 lines, and carefully finished; these were the remains of a restoration of the time of the Herods on the ancient foundation of Solomon's wall. 3. In 1860 the dragoman of the French consul built a house, close to the west side of the present Judgment Gate, and in digging down for the rock found, at a depth of 18 feet below the surface, a fragment of a wall, resembling in all respects that described above in the first case. From these three points I ascertained the course of the west side of the wall; it remained therefore to search for the northern face towards the Damascus gate, and an opportunity occurred before long, when the Greek Archimandrite Bisarion repaired and strengthened a house (now temporarily occupied by the Russian consulate). I dug some pits to examine its foundation, but no remains of antiquity were discovered, and the only result of my labours was to ascertain the true level of ancient Jerusalem at this spot.—*Jerusalem Explored*, pp. 32, 33.

The second of these vestiges of the second wall we suppose to be the same with that subsequently identified as such by Count de Vogüé, whose description of the venerable relic we shall anxiously look for in a subsequent part of his splendid work now in progress. It is the first, we presume, which is noticed by Mr. Lewin in the following extract, where he is speaking of the—

‘Intended site of the new Russian consulate, in the angle whereof the eastern limb is formed by the bazaars in Damascus Street, and the southern limb by the street which runs off westward from Damascus Street, on the south side of the court of the Holy Sepulchre. Here the ground has been excavated some ten or twelve feet, and very interesting remains have been brought to light. They consist of massive bevelled stones, each about 7 feet long and nearly 5 feet wide. Those at the east of the angle are apparently not *in situ*, for they are isolated and not connected with other stones of a similar character, either above or below or at the sides. Those, on the contrary, which make the angle itself are in their original places; and what must not escape notice is, that the stones are bevelled on the southern and eastern surfaces, but not on the northern and western, nor are the walls of a sufficient breadth to have served for an outer fortification. It must therefore be inferred that either they belonged to some public building, or if they entered into the outer city wall, there must have been other stones joining on to them on the north and west, which increased the thickness, and might have been bevelled on the exterior; or else, which is perhaps more probable than all, one of the towers stood formerly on this spot, and the angle which still remains was on the interior. What is the most striking feature about the stones is that they are precisely of the same character with those seen at the Wailing-place and at the corners of the Haram, namely, the bevel is very shallow and the surface finely smoothed. They must, there-

fore, be referable to the highest antiquity, and may be a remnant of the second wall erected by David or Solomon."—*Lewin*, p. 158.

We cannot at present acquiesce in the course of the second wall from the Gate of Judgment, as drawn either by Count de Vogüé or Signor Pierotti. According to their idea, it turned at a sharp angle and crossed the valley of the Tyropœon almost in the line of the Via Dolorosa, until it joined the outer wall of the Fortress Antonia. Our principal objection to this hypothesis is, that it so greatly circumscribes the limits of the Lower City of Josephus, and actually leaves no hill at all corresponding to Acra, which certainly is described by Josephus as occupying a gibbous-shaped hill which supported the Lower Market—a comparison utterly unintelligible on the theory of the Acra of the two Plans now before us.

2. We pass on to the third wall, that of Agrippa, as to the course of which there is so close an agreement between Dr. Rosen Signor Pierotti and Count de Vogüé, against all that have gone before them, that it seems scarcely possible that it can be accidental, or the result of independent researches. It is true indeed that the comparatively recent discovery of the large excavations under the northern hill of the modern city, known by the natives as the Cotton Grotto, and identified by general consent of antiquaries with the Royal Caves of Josephus, would probably have modified the views of Drs. Robinson, Schultz, and others, who having been taught to identify the Royal Caves of Josephus with the Tombs of the Kings or other sepulchral excavations in the Upper Valley of the Kedron, were forced to give the third wall an enormous expansion in this direction, in order to satisfy the language of the historian. There can, however, be no question that the course now assigned to it, identical with that of the northern segment of the modern city wall, from the Tower of David to the Mosk inclosure, much more nearly corresponds with the details of measurement given by Josephus; and although we have not yet had the advantage of considering the arguments of Count de Vogüé in favour of that new disposition of the wall, we must say that those of Signor Pierotti, a summary of which we proceed to give, seem to leave us no choice but to surrender the more extended line of defence set up by former travellers, and to take our stand behind the less ambitious but much more defensible works which the architect engineer of Surraya Pasha has been the first to erect. We must do so, however, with one word of hearty reprobation for Josephus, whose habit of exaggeration, so justly appreciated by Count de Vogüé (pp. 17, 18), was well calculated to mislead unwary antiquaries, when once so important a landmark as the Royal Caves had been lost from sight.

Signor Pierotti thus states the case for the third wall, as he draws it, and we observe that he is not only entirely at one with Count de Vogüé as to the course of this wall, but that they also agree in fixing the site of the Psephine Tower to the north-west angle of the modern city, where the massive remains of ancient masonry, known to the natives as *Kasr Jalād*, Goliath's Castle, and to Europeans as Tancred's Tower, still preserve in their form and structure a reminiscence of that masterpiece of Jewish fortification.

'In laying down the course of this wall I differ from all those (in particular Barclay, Schultz, and Robinson) who, up to the present time, have written on the topography of ancient Jerusalem. I am led to do this by the careful investigations which, during a long time, I carried on in the district north of the city. It is my positive opinion that the ancient walls did not extend to the north beyond the present inclosure; that is, that they began at the Jaffa Gate, passed by the Damascus Gate, and ended at the north-east corner of the *Haram-es-Sherif*. Let me now state the facts which have led me to this conclusion.

'In 1860 the Greek convent repaired the building outside the Jaffa Gate, now used as a custom-house. Wishing to lay some foundations against the city wall, I came, on digging down, upon those of Agrippa's, which rest upon the rock; now we know that this wall near to Hippicus was defended by the steep slope of the side of the valley, and that where this ceased, towards the north-west corner, a ditch was cut in the rock. This may still be seen, and is a proof that I am right in supposing the present to be the wall that went from Hippicus to Psephinus.

'At the north-west corner a massive ruin still exists inside the city, rising about twenty feet above the ground, and built of small stones joined with strong mortar; in the south-west corner however are found large stones, rusticated after the Herodian pattern. On digging about the shapeless pile, I discovered that courses of similar stones continued down to the rock. I also found two sides of masonry, and many large rusticated stones buried in the rubbish, and traces of a great cistern. Hence I consider this to be the site of the tower Psephinus, an octagon in form, and seventy cubits high. Beyond these ruins, outside the present wall, is a ditch cut in the rock, unquestionably a work of the Herodian age, for no later conquerors would have had the time or desire to execute such a great and costly work. It is now concealed by rubbish, but it runs eastward parallel to the present wall, which therefore can scarcely have extended beyond it, in the course laid down by Barclay, Schultz, and many others.

'The position I assign to Psephinus is the highest point in the city; therefore as the tower was seventy cubits high, we can understand that from its top the confines of Arabia and the sea (the Dead Sea) might be visible; indeed, the latter may even now be seen from the terraces of the highest houses in the neighbourhood of the ruins.'—*Jerusalem Explored*, pp. 34, 35.

Time and space forbid us to follow our author in his careful survey of the ground along which the north wall is carried, and in his conscientious investigation of the text of Josephus, by which he establishes his points one by one to our entire satisfaction; but we must extract another passage in which he seems to us to dispose most effectually of those who would still maintain the theory of a more extended expansion of the wall of Agrippa.

'Let us also consider the conformation of the ground on the north. Josephus has distinctly stated that the city was inclosed by a triple wall, except on the side of the valleys, where there was but one, as this part was inaccessible. These few words appear to me to be fatal to any theory that lays down Agrippa's wall near the Tomb of the Kings. If he had begun to build it on the ridge south of the upper part of the Kidron valley, the Jews would of course have completed it on the same spot, and Josephus would not have omitted to state that the city was defended to a considerable extent, by a valley on the north. But on this point he is silent, and finding his description correct in other respects, I cannot suppose that he has made an omission in this.'—*Pierotti*, p. 41.

'Lastly, I assert that no signs of defensive works, natural or artificial, are found to the north or north-east of the present walls. From the Jaffa Gate to the Tombs of the Kings, and thence to the north-east corner of the walls, there is not the slightest trace of the foundation or the masonry of the outer walls; no great hewn stones scattered over or buried in the ground: nothing but twenty-six vaulted cisterns hollowed out in the rock, and four very small pools, which could not have supplied the large population that must have covered this space; the rock, though in places worked, is generally rough and untouched by any tool: the soil is everywhere red and clayey, its natural condition; another proof that it was never built over, for where the houses have been destroyed by fire or age, it is of a blackish or greyish colour, and contains fragments of walls, or at least hewn stones in plenty. Let any one examine the south part of Sion or Ophel, and contradict my assertion if he can. On the south, heaps of broken stones and rubbish are scattered over a grey soil; on the north is bare rock, or a scanty, though rich, virgin earth.

'Some, however, infer an extension of the city to the north, from the occurrence not only of cisterns but also of small cubes of stone, belonging to mosaic pavements, and of certain walls, which, without proper examination, have been considered to be ancient Jewish work. But these remains are not of any value, because, as stated by Josephus, there were houses and gardens in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem to the north. We may, indeed, infer the same from the words of Nehemiah, because we cannot imagine persons engaged in the service of the Temple living elsewhere in the environs of the city, on account of the great number of tombs in every other part. Houses also stood here at the time of the Crusades, and a church dedicated to the Martyrdom of S. Stephen; therefore the occurrence of some mosaics and stones is easily accounted for. For all these reasons I deny that the walls extended farther to the north than their present position; and if the advocates of other theories are not convinced, I invite them to examine the places for themselves, when they will see that I have spoken the truth.'—*Pierotti*, pp. 42, 43.

3. We have yet to direct the reader's attention to the most important of all Signor Pierotti's discoveries, viz. those which resulted from his subterranean investigations in and about the Haram, the full value and significance of which it will take some years to realize.

The first of these which we shall notice is a grand gallery or vault which passes under the Via Dolorosa, a little east of the point where it is spanned by the arch of the *Ecce Homo*, of which arch it may be noticed in passing that its side portal on the north, with a niche and other details of its construction, fully vindicate its claims to be considered a veritable Roman



gateway, belonging, as Signor Pierotti believes, to the period of Hadrian's restoration of the city as *Ælia Capitolina*.

He was engaged upon a building for the establishment of the Filles de Sion, on the north side of the Via Dolorosa, in close proximity to the arch.

'In order to build a buttress at the north-east corner, and at the same time to lay new foundations in a small plot of land on the north, I was obliged to dig a hole, 18 feet deep below the level of the street, which rises towards Bezetha; and on the 3d of June came upon a layer of large slabs, each 4 or 5 feet long, 3 or 4 feet wide, and 9 or 10 inches thick. On removing two of these I found a square hole, through which I entered, or rather fell, into the vault I was looking for, but the intense heat and foul air compelled me to beat a hasty retreat, and have the aperture enlarged to permit the air to circulate more freely. Meanwhile I continued excavating a little to the north, and met with the wall bounding the vault on that side, and found  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet below its top (measured from the outer surface) the original entrance; by which I obtained easy access for myself and afterwards for many others.

'The end of the east side of this gallery is just at the south-east angle of the building on the north, separated from the body of the convent by a small level street; and it terminates at the north-west angle of the *Haram-es-Sherif*; the floor throughout the whole length slopes slightly and is formed in the rock; though the place was partly filled with earth at the north end, and with filthy stinking mud at the south, I thoroughly examined it and made a plan and elevation. At the entrance a stone staircase, with steps about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide, afforded an easy descent; but unfortunately I was obliged to mutilate this, in order to construct a pier to sustain the weight of the north-east corner of the building above. The side walls are founded on the rock, which appears above the level of the floor, at a distance of 69 feet from the entrance, and gradually rises in them up to the southern extremity. They are built of squared blocks, generally  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet long, and from above 2 to 3 feet high, perfectly fitted together. The semicircular vaulting is admirable, being formed of oblong stones,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet long, and 8 inches high. Its exact regularity is its most striking feature.

'I consider that this gallery was remodelled during the Roman period, because some holes in it to admit the water are no part of the original design. In the east wall is a semicircular arched door, built up, whose width and height show that it was formerly the entrance of a passage. Along the side walls are semicircular headed apertures, which, together with the two openings of the same shape, opposite one to another, near the south end, are also no part of the original design. These two are the beginnings of conduits, one of which ran eastward down to the Pool of Bethesda; the other westward, into the Tyropœon valley. The accumulated water and filth did not allow me to make a close examination of these, but, as far as I could see at the openings, the masonry and shape of the stones led me to think that they formed part of a Roman restoration. A short distance from these the gallery is closed by a wall, entirely of Arab work; but I made a temporary opening in it, and was able to continue my examination as far as the *Haram-es-Sherif*; the ground of which is about 8 feet above the top of the vault. The quantity of water, earth, and filth, prevented my approaching the rock at the end, and ascertaining the means of communication with the surface at the *Haram*, but as I saw that the south-east corner was built up, I have no doubt there had been access at that point. It immediately occurred to me that the vault had originally been a passage between Bezetha and Moriah, and was the "Strato's Tower," where Antigonus, younger brother of Aristobulus (the sons of John Hyrcanus), was murdered by the treacherous devices of the Queen Alexandra.'

Before leaving this arch we must notice another curious and important discovery made by Signor Pierotti, while engaged upon these works, which excited great interest among the inhabitants of Jerusalem, specially among the Jews, who, regarding the discovery of a source of living water in the Holy City by the light of Zechariah's prophecy, supposed that nothing less than the immediate appearance of their long-expected Messiah could be harbingered by this fountain.

'I have, however, not yet exhausted the objects of interest afforded by the property of the Convent of the Daughters of Sion. On continuing the excavation to the north in order to lay new foundations at a depth of 36 feet below the street, water was met with in abundance. At first I supposed it had filtered through from some cistern; but as it did not increase or diminish, I had the excavation deepened and enlarged, and then discovered, to the north of the water, a perpendicular face of hewn rock; and on digging deeper, a small conduit cut in it, through which the water ran from north to south. I was anxious to follow it in these directions, but was prevented by the depth of the soil, the houses in the neighbourhood, and above all by the customs of the country, and so was obliged to restrict my researches to that spot, and even there the owner did not allow me to do much, fearing to attract the attention of the Mohammedans. I ascertained, however, that this water did not enter the gallery, because after drawing off all that was found there, no more appeared beyond what drained from the street after rain, while the stream flowed continuously southward, yielding a constant supply for building purposes. During the first three days its water was muddy and brackish, but afterwards it gradually became clearer, but always had a disagreeable taste and contained the same ingredients as that at the springs of the *Hammam-es-Shefa*, and at Fountain of the Virgin in the Kidron valley. From the day of its discovery (June 12, 1860), to the end of January, 1861, it yielded a daily supply of from 200 to 250 gallons without any diminution, and was not affected by the fall of rain or snow. At this time I resigned the charge of the works to a master-mason, as all the difficulties had been overcome, but I am told that the water continued to flow, and has done so abundantly up to the present date (April, 1863). From several investigations which I will mention in the chapter on the waters, I infer that this stream enters the well of the *Hammam-es-Shefa*.'—*Pierotti*, p. 63.

Our last extracts from Signor Pierotti's volume shall be those which relate to the series of discoveries connected with the water-supply and sewage of the Haram-es-Sheriff, which can only have belonged to the Jewish Temple, and so serve to fix the site of that building, beyond all reasonable doubt, on the raised platform of the Mosk area, in the native rock of which most of these cisterns and conduits are excavated. We know nothing more interesting in the whole range of modern antiquarian discovery than the narrative of these investigations in which Signor Pierotti recovered one link after another of that chain of evidence which, when completed, supplied a demonstrative proof of the fidelity in all main points of the rabbinical writers' accounts relating to the Temple, as well as of the trustworthiness of the oral traditions with reference to the site.

We commence our extracts with one in which he argues on

*à priori* grounds for the existence of large subterranean aqueducts and sewers under the Temple area, a point on which the reticence of Holy Scripture is certainly remarkable.

'As Solomon had built in the Temple inclosure houses for the Levites, besides the laver and altar of burnt-offering, it was necessary for him to construct conduits and cisterns to bring, to keep, and to carry off water for the religious ceremonies and the various purposes of daily life, as well as to remove the blood of the victims and other refuse. On this point the Bible is silent; but we can easily see that there were not any sources of drinkable water in the Temple and its vicinity, or indeed in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; and that the rain-water alone could not be depended upon for a supply sufficient for the wants of the place; we may therefore assert with confidence that Solomon must have made great works to bring water from distant sources, as from Etham (Eccl. ii. 6), where an abundant quantity could always be obtained; with cisterns to keep it and conduits attached to convey it to different parts of the platform of the Sanctuary.

'We are told that the victims were slain on the north, the blood sprinkled about the altar, and the refuse cast away towards the east, in the "place of the ashes," and the priest's chambers, built on the north side of the altar of burnt-offerings. Hence it follows that drains must have existed at the altar of burnt-offerings, on the north side, and at the "place of the ashes." That these and many other things were constructed by Solomon, we shall presently see from my investigations in the *Haram-es-Sherif*:—P. 49.

We shall follow the order of Dr. Pierotti's narrative in his discovery of the various meshes of this complicated network of aqueducts and sewers; because, although it has the inconvenience of commencing at the end of the series, it appears to represent chronologically the progress of his discoveries, and so intensifies the interest with which we watch the gradual development of that masterpiece of engineering skill and invention, which devised and executed this elaborate system of drainage some three thousand years ago!

After repeated inquiries among the natives of Jerusalem, and some faint and unsatisfactory hints of hidden passages, from the *fellahin* of Siloam, accident at last led him to the first identification of the great sewer by which the blood of the victims was carried from the Temple area to the Pool of Siloam, along the steep and narrow brow of the hill, parallel to the wall of the Haram, which is now occupied by a Moslem burial-ground.

'In the month of September, 1857, I was walking outside the east wall of the Haram, and stopped to watch an Arab who was digging a grave near the southern extremity of the cemetery. I entered into conversation with him, with a view of quietly examining his excavation; but on reaching a depth of three feet he stopped, as his work was finished; for the dead Arabs like the earth to lie light upon them. However, by a present I induced him to continue his labour; but, after going down about 2 feet more, he again desisted, at the instigation of another workman, who in the meantime had come to bring him some food. A little more money set them both at work, and after sinking 2 feet lower, they came upon something hard, which on examination proved to be a wall, belonging, as I suspected, to a conduit; and by widening the excavation a little, we found the corresponding side wall at a distance of 3½ feet, both being of great age. I would gladly have had them continue their

work; but they were both tired, and also afraid of being seen digging so deep, in the company of a European and Christian; besides, the corpse was expected before long; so they partially filled up the hole as quickly as possible. I was, however, satisfied with what I had seen, and a few days after, having obtained permission from the Pasha, on some trifling pretext, I employed them, with two other workmen, to make an excavation opposite to the south-east corner of the Haram (not being able to dig farther to the north on account of the graves); and after two days' hard work we found, at a depth of 11 feet, remains of a conduit resembling the former, and, like it,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet in breadth. The walls were  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet high, but had been higher, the upper part having been destroyed.' —P. 93.

Our author next conducts us to the causeway on the west side of the Mosk inclosure, where the aqueduct from Solomon's Pools enters the Sacred Precinct; and which was called in the times of the Second Temple the 'coming down of the waters.'

'During the winter of 1858 and 1859 no great quantity of rain fell at Jerusalem, and the cisterns were in consequence not filled; so that in the summer months there was a scarcity of water. Under these circumstances, Surrya Pasha ordered the conduit from Etham to be repaired, in order that it might supply the Haram. I availed myself of this circumstance, and entered many of the cisterns in that precinct, which were either almost or quite dry, under the pretext of inspecting them to see if they needed repairs. In the year 1856, when Kiamil Pasha was governor, the Turkish engineer, Assad Effendi, had restored the aqueduct, and I had assisted him as a volunteer, and been able to offer him some useful advice; which was the reason that I was now employed.

'I will now relate my discoveries in connexion with this conduit, commencing at the point where it enters Moriah.

'It comes down by the dyke or bridge crossing the Tyropæon, and at the present time empties itself into a small basin opposite to the entrance of the Mekhemeh; but formerly it flowed into a large reservoir, still existing in the lower part of that building, whence it went on into the Temple. This chamber is now disused and filled with rubbish. Thus by their carelessness the Mohammedans lose the benefit of all the works of antiquity in Jerusalem. From the above-named basin two conduits branch out; the smaller and newer supplies water to the fountain in the middle of the Mekhemeh, and then rejoins the larger and older one ( $2\frac{3}{4}$  feet wide and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet high), which, after passing under the Bab-es-Salsala, enters the Haram, and then, after running some little distance southward, turns off at an angle and goes to the fountain opposite the Mosque-el-Aksa, whence it proceeds to the great cistern called Birket-es-Sultan.'—P. 95.

Dr. Pierotti then describes this remarkable rock-hewn cistern, Birket-es-Sultan, which fulfilled the important office of controlling and regulating the water supply of the Temple according to the season, and according to the exigencies of the sacrificial services.

'The water in the Birket es-Sultan (Prince's Pool) was, at the time of my visit, a foot deep; the sides and vaulting, with the piers supporting it, have been hewn with great pains out of the rock. It is 32 feet in height. In the wall near the opening from the fountain are notches cut in the rock, obviously to be used as steps. There are two apertures in its west side, the one already mentioned as coming from the fountain which almost touches the vaulting; the other 4 feet lower down and blocked up, which is the end of the conduit

coming from the cistern near the Mosque of the Mograbins. There is another opening on the north which I could not examine; it is under the vaulting. On the south-east, 4 feet below the vaulting, is an opening walled up, corresponding with the great chamber at the south-east angle of the inclosure, as I was able to ascertain by examining the north-west corner of that place, after removing a quantity of earth. On the south is another opening (now closed with Arab masonry), 3 feet above the floor,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet high; the beginning of a conduit mainly excavated and vaulted in the rock, but for a short distance built with stones and roofed with large slabs, which I have traced with difficulty and labour along its whole course quite close to the Fountain of the Virgin. At certain points it is 5 feet wide and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet high.—P. 96.

We come now to the most wonderful of all these marvels: to the solution, namely, of the grand difficulty connected with the mysterious cave in the Sacred Rock of the Haram, beneath which, according to Moslem tradition, was the 'Well of Souls,' in the hidden depths of which our first mother, Eve, and the Virgin Mary, were engaged in spinning wool and weaving garments for the souls in Paradise!

The delusion was dispelled in a manner not altogether agreeable perhaps to the poetical imagination of the inventors or propagators of the legend, but very satisfactory for historical and archæological purposes.

'We will now examine the cisterns to the north of the Mosque es-Sakharah. On entering the northern one ( $29\frac{1}{2}$  feet deep) I found the floor covered with wet mud to the depth of about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  feet. At the first glance I saw an opening on the south side, 3 feet wide and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  high, half built up with Arab masonry, and after clearing away some of the stones, earth, and mud that blocked it up, I passed through it into another cistern in the same direction, 32 feet deep. These are both very ancient, and are wholly excavated in the rock; and I have no doubt that they belonged to the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. On the south and on the east of the deeper cistern are the openings to two passages; the first leads to a conduit (3 feet wide and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  high), descending from the west; but after going a few feet along the passage we find another conduit of the same size as the above, coming from the south, and leading upwards into a double cistern, as I had always expected. The form of the lower chamber is an irregular sphere, about 22 or 23 feet in diameter, its floor is covered deep with dry mud, with a few stones (but rather too many for me to remove). On a careful examination I saw, at a height of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  feet, the mouth of the hole leading to the upper chamber, about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  feet in diameter and 4 feet long, and the marble slab which we have already mentioned as covering it. This it was that the Santon struck with his foot or stick to prove the existence of the "Well of the Souls" below! There is a conduit on the south, into which I entered through an aperture (now walled up), and by a very gradual ascent reached the other extremity at the fountain opposite to the Mosque el-Aksa. The whole depth of the double cistern is  $28\frac{1}{2}$  feet below the top of the rock, and  $23\frac{1}{2}$  below the pavement of the mosque. The reader may imagine my joy at this result of my labours, so long desired and so anxiously sought, and the gratitude I felt to God for granting me this boon of ascertaining the position of the altar of burnt-offerings, and the cisterns and conduits for blood belonging to the ancient Temple; an ample recompense for all my toil.'—P. 98.

Only one link was now wanting to complete the chain which

would bind together the aqueduct from Etham with the sewer of Siloam, and this was soon supplied in those large rock-hewn cisterns, which underlie the area to the east of the raised platform and south-west of the Golden Gate, which have channels running into them from the west and north, and one running out of them on the east.

'On entering the cistern, excavated in the rock on the west of the Golden Gate, I found that it was 20 feet deep, and that on the west side was the mouth of the conduit, which I partially examined from the cistern north of the Mosque es-Sakharah. I was able to pass along it for some distance on this side also, and found it to be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide and 3 high. The only thing that now remained to be done was to find the conduit leading out of the cistern towards the east; and after a long search I had begun to despair, when a labourer, who was working at the south side of the chamber, told me that there were signs of an opening there; in a few minutes it was uncovered, and through it I entered into another cistern, whose floor was 4 feet below the level of the former; and on the east side of this was a conduit,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide and 3 high, running towards the Haram wall, which must have communicated with that the ruins of which I had found outside the east wall. I had thus completed a chain of evidence, which established the course of the conduit for blood, as laid down by me, at every point.

'Marks of another opening appeared above the soil on the south side of the same chamber, but I had not time to uncover it, being recalled into the first cistern by the discovery of another passage on its north side; through this I entered a series of cisterns on a level of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet above the central. In the last of these, at the north end, was the entrance to a conduit ( $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide and high) which sloped upwards in the direction of the Pool of Bethesda. It was impossible to follow it up; but from its direction, level, and design (as I will presently show), it must have corresponded with the opening (walled up) to which I called attention at the south-east corner of the above pool.'—P. 98.

We present the deductions from this series of discoveries in the language of our author, only expressing our general acquiescence in his conclusions, so far as we have been able to test them.

'Having thus narrated the investigations I have made and the information I have collected, I will now state my conclusions on the connexions and purposes of these underground works. They are as follows:—1. That from the time of the building of the Temple the conduit from Etham has emptied itself into the cistern beneath the *Mekhemeh*, whence the water was conveyed into the Temple by a branching system of conduits, the chief of which I have traced. 2. That the cistern north of the Mosque of the Mograbins was used as a reservoir to supply Ophel, where, at the present time, but few traces of these works are found. 3. The conduit leading from this into the *Birket-es-Sultan* must have been intended to carry away any excess of water, and also by this means to relieve that which now goes to the fountain, especially when it might be out of order. It is obvious that these filled the *Birket-es-Sultan*, and consequently the great reservoir at the south-east corner of the *Haram*. 4. It is probable that the numerous cisterns on the west side may also have been fed by different conduits, but I had not sufficient time to ascertain this. If not, they might have been supplied by the drainings from the courts, the terrace-roofs of the cloisters, and the Temple itself. 5. The fountain opposite to *el-Aksa* is Saracenic, but not the basin in which it stands. This supplied water to the cistern under the altar of burnt-offerings, to cleanse it from the blood that



flowed down from above. Hence the stream ran into the cisterns on the north, and thence into the "place of the ashes" on the east, which I believe to have been the southernmost of the underground chambers; and from this it went outside the wall, and after passing along parallel to it, finally emptied itself into the pool near the Fountain of the Virgin. 6. In the "place of the ashes," in which they cast the crops of the birds, the entrails of the victims, and other refuse, a larger quantity of water would be needful, especially at times when the sacrifices were numerous; and I suppose that the conduit from the Pool of Bethesda was constructed to augment the supply; also I fully believe that if I had found time to uncover the apertures on the south of the "place of the ashes," and on the north of the *Birket-es-Sultan*, and to examine the cistern on the south-east of the *Sakharah*, I should have discovered that this cistern (where I place the "bronze sea") was supplied from the *Birket*, and discharged its waters into the "place of the ashes."—*Pierotti*, p. 100.

And now that we must reluctantly take leave of 'Jerusalem Explored,' we can but regret that our limited space has allowed us to do but scanty justice to this great work. We have been obliged to leave some of its most important discussions entirely untouched, and cannot so much as refer to many of the most original and interesting theories of its author. With all deductions that the most hostile criticism can demand for some serious blemishes in the plans and other illustrations—which need not here be detailed, as they have been already unsparingly exposed in the columns of the *Times*—Dr. Pierotti's work takes its place as one of the chief authorities on the topography and archæology of Jerusalem, and the author may indeed congratulate himself that his toilsome labours and costly sacrifices have not been expended in vain.

The fag end of a long article is not the place to do justice to such a work as that of the Count de Vogüé, which we have hitherto noticed only incidentally on account of the remarkable coincidence of some of his views on topographical questions with those of Dr. Pierotti. Indeed, we are scarcely yet sufficiently acquainted with this splendid work (of which the fourth part has reached us as we were going to press, and which is not yet complete) to venture on a lengthy notice; for although we have followed his arguments with intense interest, so far as he has already gone, yet we have been too often baffled in our attempts to consult his maps and plans—essential to the clear understanding of the text, referred to in the notes, but not yet published—to suppose that we have really mastered the subject.

Reserving this work then for future notice, we must here limit ourselves to the performance of a promise which we made at the opening of this paper, which was this:—to trace the connexion which exists between the recent discoveries which have been made on the east of the Jordan and in Central Syria, to which we have here called attention, and the questions in debate

among archæologists as to the date to be assigned to the architectural remains of Jerusalem.

Setting aside the Saracenic masonry, Count de Vogüé has satisfied himself that the real antiquities of Jerusalem belong mainly to two periods, those of Herod the Great and the Emperor Justinian. To the former he assigns the large bevelled masonry with which all are by this time familiar, and which it has been the practice to assign to Solomon and his successors the kings of Judah; to the latter those richly ornamented works, the remains of which are seen in the Golden Gate and the Gate of Huldah. The analogies of the latter he has found in the ruined cities of Central Syria, already described, which belong to precisely the same era; the earliest example of the former he has traced to Arak-el-Emir, with the following notices of which we conclude. It is happily a dated monument, erected about 176 B.C. by the elder Hyrcanus, under circumstances thus described by Josephus:—

‘However, Hyrcanus determined not to return to Jerusalem any more, but seated himself beyond Jordan, and was at perpetual war with the Arabians, and slew many of them, and took many of them captives. He also erected a strong castle, and built it entirely of white stone, to the very roof; and had animals of a prodigious magnitude engraven upon it. He also drew around it a great and deep canal of water. He also made caves of many furlongs in length, by hollowing a rock that was over against him, and then he made large rooms in it, some for feasting, and some for sleeping and living in. He introduced also a vast quantity of waters which ran along it, and which were very delightful and ornamental in the court. But still he made the entrances at the mouth of the caves so narrow, that no more than one person could enter by them at once: and the reason why he built them after that manner was a good one: it was for his own preservation lest he should be besieged by his brethren, and run the hazard of being caught by them. Moreover, he built the courts of greater magnitude than ordinary, which he adorned with vastly large gardens. And when he had brought the place to this state, he named it Tyre. This place is between Arabia and Judæa beyond Jordan, not far from the country of Heshbon.’—*Whiston’s Josephus, Antiquities*, Book xii. ch. 4, sec. 11.

The ruins of this castle were first discovered and identified by Mr. Banks, in company with Captains Irby and Mangles, early in this century, and are thus described:

‘We left Heshbon, passing by a stream which, if followed, would probably have led to the pools. We then proceeded along the road to Szalt, and in about four hours arrived at a place called by the natives Arragel-Emir. Here are the ruins of an edifice constructed of very large stones, some of which are twenty feet long, and so broad that one constitutes the thickness of the wall. The ruin is situated upon a square platform or terrace of some extent, with a stream below. From the situation, and from the circumstance of large beasts, in relief, being sculptured about it, Mr. Banks believed it to be the palace of Hircan, who, according to Josephus, being driven across the Jordan by his brother Alexander, king of Jerusalem, had built a palace in this neighbourhood, surrounded by hanging gardens, traces of which are yet visible. There are many artificial caves in a large range of perpendicular cliff near it;

some of these are in the form of regular stables, in which feeding-troughs still remain, sufficient for thirty or forty horses, with holes in the live rock for the head fastenings. Some of the caves are chambers and small sleeping apartments, probably for servants and attendants. There are two rows of these chambers; the upper one has a sort of projecting balcony across the front of the chambers. There is one large hall finely proportioned, with some Hebrew characters inscribed over the doorway; the whole is approached by a sort of causeway.'—*Irby and Mangles, Travels*, p. 473. Ed. 1823.

How little could those travellers have anticipated the important rôle which that ruined castle was to play in the illustration of the Architectural History of Jerusalem under Herod the Great!

In conclusion, we cannot dissemble the satisfaction which we feel in the conviction, that the result of all recent researches into the topography of Jerusalem, is to confirm the principal traditions relating to the Holy Places. The state of the argument, and the evidence on this long and earnestly-disputed question, is very ably and dispassionately stated by the learned Dane, the title of whose recently published pamphlet stands at the head of this article. We hail the appearance of a Lutheran advocate for the authenticity of the traditional sites as a hopeful sign that theological prejudice is no longer to prevail over reason in the consideration of this subject; and the authors quoted in this elaborate treatise prove that Dr. Becker does not stand alone, when he concludes as follows:—

'Conformably to the whole preceding argumentation we cannot but express our agreement in every essential point with Chateaubriand, Williams, and Berggren, in giving our assent to the old traditions in reference to the site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre.'—P. 28.

ART. IX.—1. *Manchester Church Congress*. 1863.—Official Report.

2. *Guardian* for October and November, 1864.—*Bristol Church Congress*. *Mr. Disraeli's Speech at Oxford*.

3. *Union Review Almanack* for 1865—Hayes.

THE writers who so complacently talk of the Church movement of 1833 as a phase long past and forgotten, of the religious and social progress of England, are every day convicted of egregious self-deception. No doubt the movement has gone through many changes since the publication of Tract No. I. It was an 'Oxford' movement; now Cambridge seems asserting itself as a centre of orthodox Church life. It was a 'Tractarian' movement, but the Tracts were extinguished more than twenty years since. It was the 'Newmania,' and it is full twenty years since Dr. Newman was with us. It was 'Puseyism,' but it is long since Dr. Pusey has appeared in the attitude of continuous public leadership, although at the present moment much *ante ora virōm*.

What, however, it was at the first, and what it continues to be down to the day on which we are writing, is a movement having, as its motive power, a deeper recognition than has for many generations existed among us, on the one hand, of a visible universal Church, and of sacramental ordinances, as the logically necessary correlative, 'through the ages all along,' in that Church, of the Incarnation; and on the other, of the Church of England, as fulfilling, within its limits, the idea of such a Church, and as supplying those sacraments. If this view of Christianity (no matter for the argument whether true or false in itself) stands out conspicuously and in greater prominence throughout the 'Establishment,' and if it shapes the actions, the language, and the writings of members of that Establishment to an incalculably greater degree than it did before 1833, then the movement which came to maturity during that year has not died out, as Latitudinarian optimists would like to prove. We can understand the neologist expressing his contempt for the Church system, or the Puritan banning it; we can understand the Romanist, specially if he be a *divert*, treating the manifestations of such a system in the English Church as deleterious and dangerous hallucinations; but we cannot understand one of these men shutting his eyes to 'Anglicanism,' so called, having revealed itself in England as a great, and to this century a new power, both in relation to the

spiritual life, and also to the public actions of members of the national Church. When we had occasion five, and again, three years ago, to review the condition of Church matters, we expressed our strong conviction that what was once known as the Church party, had been broken up, and that the Church was all the same widening and strengthening itself. We make the same assertion to-day in respect to the one compact Church party which seemed at one moment ready to have marshalled itself in opposition to the well-disciplined ranks of Puritanism. It has been broken up through many causes. But while this one Church party has disappeared, there has been a signal revival lately of the spirit of partizanship within the Church of England in respect of different matters, some of a temporal, some of a spiritual, and others of a mixed character; while the accidents of this complex condition lead to strange permutations and combinations of men who used to be easy to find, either on a right or on a wrong side, but who are now perpetually changing positions like the performers in an old-fashioned country-dance. We are not making this statement either in praise or in blame, but as it is a fact, it may as well be acknowledged. The old lines were necessarily broken up as soon as that vague appellation, 'Broad Church,' had slipped into current vogue, and had been accepted by men of the most different temperaments and systems of belief, simply as an escape from the difficulties of partizanship. Undoubtedly it has, at the same time, its good side, when it results in the unostentatious adoption by those who have hitherto been classed as Low Churchmen of a distinctively Church platform, from which to work any one question of the day, as, for instance, the extension of the Episcopate.

We may generally sum up the different Church questions of the day which lead to these diversities of attitude under three heads. First, comes the practical and political side, for those two phases of Churchmanship have, by force of circumstances, been oddly amalgamated; next, we may reckon the doctrinal one, in reference, chiefly, to recent outbursts of scepticism from dignified quarters;—and finally the ritual side, running in some cases into sensational excess. In arranging these topics in this order, we have no idea of hinting any opinion as to their relative importance. We have simply arranged them as they best suit the tenour of the present article.

The co-operation for several forms of practical work, as well as for the maintenance of the Church in its corporate privileges as a portion of the body politic, of moderate members of the different parties, admits, in the first instance, of an easy solution. They felt, in one view of the matter, that it was their

duty to do something to pull together, if they meant to continue members of the same Church; and in another, they felt that there were certain things which ought to be done at the cost of a certain amount of mutual concession, so long as conscience was not violated. Naturally, the possibilities of joint action were limited to practical and political Churchmanship—any attempt at hasty doctrinal fusion would have risked opening the ugly discrepancy as to the value of the Sacraments, which is the essence of the difference between High and Low. The old game of cross-purposes which Churchmen and ministers have been playing was also, in its way, conducive to the issue of a joint Church action, after the model of a company with limited liability. Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell had, some time since, stultified themselves in the eyes of most zealous Churchmen of either complexion, by the votes they gave in favour of the Church-rates Abolition Bill. But, in compensation for this blunder, Lord Palmerston held the proxies of the entire Evangelical party, in return for the concession of episcopal patronage which he had, a few years previously, made to them; while—still preserving their favours—he was filling the four primatial sees with men bearing the orthodox names of Longley, Thomson, Beresford, and Trench; and the dioceses of Gloucester and Ely with Professors Ellicott and Harold Browne. No doubt these appointments were subsequent to the rise of the new associations. But assuredly they helped to complete the estrangement. Churchmen felt that *aide-toi* was not a meaningless adage, when it had to do with the faith they were told to put in ministers. The Church Institution was the first shape which the experiment took, and the activity of that body soon galvanized the obsolete and obscure office of rural dean into a new line of usefulness, as convener and chairman of little social societies of joint clergy and laymen, periodically meeting to debate on topics of Church interest. Of course, in a system of such novel, not to say hasty introduction, based on so little of precedent, and so much less of positive authority, the amount of talk talked, in proportion to work done, was frequently excessive. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that these meetings have done considerable service of a protective kind, besides directing public attention to questions of progressive improvement, such as diocesan synods, more bishops, and so forth; and that, above all, they have made the people who attend them feel, that to belong to a Church is to have contracted obligations of an objective kind to a visible corporate body. Withal, the rural office has been worked very hard, and cynics might be tempted to say that at bottom a zealous Church Institutionist looked on a rural dean as the keystone of the



Christian Church. The climax of incongruity was attained when the rustic title was attributed to the rectors of the large old parishes in the metropolitan boroughs. Still, the stress laid upon the decanal division was in itself harmless; and perhaps the absolute absence of sanctity or authority in the office made it an easier channel through which to work a voluntary organization, than if those clergymen had been recognised and full-blown prelates.

It was to the credit of the Church Institution and of the Church Defence Societies, *πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μέρφη μία*, that between four and five years since they felt that fragmentary meetings and a weak central body in London, itself working with half-manacled hands even as to questions of Church politics, was not sufficient to maintain the truce or strengthen the alliance between the Churchmen who had taken up the new Church movement. 'Church Congress' was the next rallying cry, originally raised in the Defence Association at Cambridge, in which University the first gathering of the kind was held in King's College Hall, in December, 1861.

The notion of a Congress was a direct offshoot, as far as England is concerned, from the British Association, which seems to have been the first to teach the lesson that men might meet in peripatetic session, by the easy elective process of buying a ticket, to lecture, to talk, and to mould each other's notions, without the final conclusion of a formal vote. Archæology soon followed suit, and later the airy nothing called 'Social Science.' The Evangelical Alliance, too, was in the nature of a congress. 'Congresses'—antiquarian, humanitarian, &c.—have also for the last twenty years or thereabouts been in fashion on the Continent; and so we should be inclined to attribute the fact of Church Congresses having made a simultaneous appearance in the Churches of England and Rome to an involuntary cyclic coincidence. Two Congresses at Mechlin, one of them distinguished by M. de Montalembert's brilliant plea for political liberty as the best safeguard of Catholicism, and the other carefully guarded from any such explosive element, but in compensation garnished by an exceedingly rich exhibition of mediæval Church art; and one at Munich, headed by the enlightened Döllinger, and snubbed accordingly from Rome, sum up the Roman Catholic list, with, we believe, some minor gatherings at Cologne and elsewhere in Germany. In England the Church Congresses have been four. The small one at Cambridge heralded a more imposing gathering at Oxford. Church Congresses at both these places were treading on velvet. Those who wished well to the movement felt that its real crisis had come when the off-hand acceptance of a spontaneous invitation to

Manchester had pinned the congressionists to holding their third session in that city during the autumn of 1863.

The objection so frequently urged against Church Congresses that they settle nothing, we put aside as trivial; or, to speak more candidly, we accept it as their distinguishing merit. A Church Congress might not find its place under a condition of Catholic perfectibility. It is just because the work is incomplete, abrupt, illogical, and unsatisfactory, that such institutions, with their prudent abstinence from claiming perfection, come in so usefully. If the truth be admitted, that opinion must now be left to regulate many things which used to be regarded as within the province of authority, machinery which is successful in bringing together so many leading representatives of so many diverse schools in the Church, for free and friendly discussion, with the hope of agreement rather than of division, must be of proved utility.

Whatever else may be doubtful in the results of these 'parliaments,' to use the term in its etymological sense, it is certain that from no juggling, as some unscrupulous organs of Puritanism try to make out, but by the irresistible logic of facts, the party which holds its own the best, and gains the most upon the other side, is the High Church one. The lesson to him who will see is obvious. Common sense compels any knot of men, among whom clergy stand in a large proportion, who meet together to debate on the good estate of their own community, under the chairmanship of its magnates, to make the common law of that community, and not their own crotchets, the rule of action. So many honest and zealous Low Churchmen, who had hitherto never been fairly brought face to face with the Church as a corporation, discovered, when volunteering to act in a combined Church gathering, that the unquestionable common law of that corporate Church contained useful elements of which they had hitherto been ignorant, or of whose importance they had hitherto made light. The other side had not this difficulty to overcome: the lesson they had to learn was one of personal forbearance and an elastic appreciation of antagonist positions, irrespective of their own intrinsic soundness.

A more solid objection, which was urged with considerable power in a paper read before the Bristol Church Union by Mr. Pocock, is the number not of open, but of *closed* questions, which in dread of a row must be entered on the 'Index Expurgatorius' of each successive Congress. We fairly say that the objection does not admit of an answer which would be logically satisfactory. Practically we believe that the half loaf of a Congress, held under the restrictions of this expurgation, is better than the no-bread of unchecked meetings, which would be impossible

from no one daring to adventure their stormy contingencies. After all, everything cannot be talked over in three days, and by a body which elects itself for five shillings a head, so that the harm of a rigidly exclusive list of subjects comes to be of a negative kind. There is one benefit arising from these Congresses which should not be overlooked, although it accrues rather to the bystanders than to the members themselves. The Congress is peripatetic, never meeting twice in the same place. It stands to reason that this sudden vision of the Church of England, in such large numbers and so great bustle, periodically flashing across the eyes of the population of a large town, must tend to exalt the idea of the Church in the place, as a large social and political power (if not also as something better), in a totally novel way. It comes to them neither in a dignified nor in a polemic guise, but large, loud it may be, brisk and popular. In coming years, when a good number of towns have been visited by this apparition, the Church will at least have been seen as it never was before. The comments of the Manchester and the Bristol penny papers on the throngs of unwonted visitors, during the Octobers of 1863 and 1864, already indicated a new sensation. It is noteworthy that the Roman Catholic Congress at Belgium did not on either occasion assemble beyond the walls of the sacerdotal city of S. Rumbold and the protection of the cardinal archbishop. Had it ventured to meet in Ghent and at Liege the parallel with England would have existed.

Upon the whole, the Congress at Manchester proved very successful. There were one or two personal contests during the earlier part of the proceedings, which adverse newspapers tried to make the most of, but in very fact they were but slight interruptions to the general gravity of the work. Free Trade Hall, time after time, was crowded. High Church and Low Church were each strongly represented; and both sides, thus for the first time brought together in large masses outside of the restraining influences of academic cloisters, made heroic efforts to behave well, and did behave as they should have done. The fact was evident to strangers, and has, we hope, not been forgotten since by the residents in the northern capital. It was clear that the Church of England, in its various phases, no doubt, but still as the Church of England, with its high side decidedly entering into the composition, so far from being unknown, or borne down by dissent or Romanism, or both, was a very strong and growing influence in Manchester, and was capable of great results there if it had confidence in itself to assert its strength. The vast rapt crowd crammed into every corner of the cathedral, which with its double aisles and galleries, if not altogether a minster-

like pile, is one of the most capacious auditoria which the English Church now possesses, and drinking in the manly sermon with which Dr. Hook started the proceedings, was one of the most striking spectacles of popular Churchmanship which the Church in these latter days has beheld.

Bristol was Manchester over again, with a difference, and that just the difference which exists between the two places in their material aspect. Both are big, bustling towns, but Manchester is the bigger and more bustling. Manchester, beyond the old Collegiate Church, now a Cathedral, and the little knot of half-timbered houses that lie between it and the Irwell, is all modern, and in no part built for pleasure. Bristol is composed of a large, staid old quarter, full of ancient houses and mediæval churches, yet refurbished up for modern needs and commerce, at the bottom of the hill, and of a genteel, half-gay, half-evangelical watering place above. Bristol and Clifton together make up one place without themselves being exactly one. So the Bristol Congress was not quite so full as the Manchester one, and matters there were taken perhaps a little more easily. The quality of the debates was certainly superior, and yet to the local community the whole affair may not have been quite so much of an event. Still, in its way, it was quite as important. The friends of Church Congresses no more desire them to become sensational than flat, and as, except in one incident, of which we shall have to speak farther on, there was no sensation about this meeting, so certainly it could not at all be accused of flatness; while the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol went to the presidential chair much better prepared for his functions than the episcopal president of the year before, clever as the Bishop of Manchester undoubtedly showed himself in learning his duties as the Congress moved on. There were also some influential persons present at Bristol who certainly would not have shown themselves there if they had not believed in the reality of the affair.

We will only mention one name. If there is a man in England who is respected for the peculiar attribute of wise caution—wisdom no doubt, but wisdom always strongly tinged with caution—it is Lord Harrowby; last year Lord Harrowby only made a spasmodic appearance at Manchester, and that as the advocate of an unpopular body, the Ecclesiastical Commission. This time he not only sat through the entire Congress, but also came forward constantly and cheerfully, to take a useful part in its deliberations. The extension of the Episcopate, or rather the multiplication of Bishops, and the introduction of something approximating to collegiate organization in large town parishes, separately debated as they were, were at bottom

phases of the same problem, the introduction of more corporate action, more systematically combined into one Church system than at present exists—the great question, in short, of order as against independency. In its own special line the multiplication of bishops received a more emphatic approval than, as far as we have means of concluding, it ever before met with, except perhaps at the Oxford Congress. The principal paper on the subject was that of Canon Kenaway, who advocated the make-shift of episcopal curates, or otherwise, of ‘suffragans.’ We do not believe that in the long run this expedient would satisfy any one. Still, merely as an expedient, it is better than that untold troops of children, ay, and of adults, in village after village, and town after town in every county, should go on lacking the grace of confirmation. After all—even with a bishop per county all round—that bishop would be none the worse for having his curate, on the same grounds of common sense, just as any vicar within his diocese would be better off with similar help. In favour of doubling of the episcopate, that is, of assigning a bishop generally speaking for every county, instead of the present average of one for two, the emphatic and unexpected testimony of Lord Harrowby may now be quoted. When a Churchman of his school—an Ecclesiastical Commissioner, moreover—stood up so manfully to communicate his personal desire for so wide a reform, to many hundred auditors and the representatives of the London press, it was clear that the subject had reached no early stage of ripeness. The Court of Appeal, remanded to a section, evoked a debate in which Dr. Pusey’s and Mr. Keble’s now unwonted appearances in congregated throngs elicited long and fervid applause. Church architecture and decoration were in their turn down-rightly handled as matters which deserved to be treated on their own merits, as topics of solid importance in a Church gathering, not by way of disparaging comparison, never brought in with some shambling excuse about externals, non-essentials, and such other stuff that no man thinks of, and no man vents when planning or extolling his own house. The debate on the Irish Church, which elicited a really eloquent and logical oration from the Dean of Cork, stood in favourable contrast to the parallel discussion at Manchester. The education of the Clergy was a novel, but every day increasingly important, topic for public discussion. The subject which was most feebly handled, was the cardinal one of foreign missions. One speech there delivered—that of Canon McNeill—has been characterised, by a calm and moderate critic, in terms of reprobation which we will not repeat. But apart from this unfortunate ebullition, the whole of that evening’s debate was of very inferior quality. There were *ad*

*captandum* appeals and nice anecdotes prettily pointed, but the appeals and the anecdotes did not rise above the average platform level, and seemed to be rather addressed to the bonnets, which formed an indiscriminate stranger's gallery all about the meeting, than to the uncovered heads of the lords of the creation, both lay and clerical, in whose hands rested the practical arbitrament. The final lecture on Church music must also be exempted from our praise, as with singular want of tact the lecturer took advantage of his position to utter a tirade against recognised Church arrangements, going so far as to advocate the admission of women into choirs.

Next year's Congress stands fixed for the Eastern Counties at Norwich. The President will be Bishop Pelham, and the seat of the meeting the town in which Brother Ignatius has fixed his headquarters. We hope the meeting will be concluded as pleasantly for Church prospects as those which have gone before it, but there are already ugly omens in the sky. In one respect the Norwich meeting might and ought to improve upon its predecessors—in the attendance, we mean, of Bishops. It is a very short-sighted policy in our prelates in these times, when, as we have said, opinion must often be substituted for authority, not to gain influence by showing a genial and unsuspicious readiness to take the lead in such gatherings, which if not formal and official, are assuredly not irregular in any offensive sense. At Manchester the episcopate was represented by the Bishops of Manchester, Oxford, Sydney, Mauritius, and, we believe, British Columbia; at Bristol by those of Gloucester and Bristol, Chichester, Ely, and Antigua; and the Archbishop of Armagh would, we believe, have been there had not business detained him. A bishop of this generation ought never to fear entering into a debate, even at a mixed meeting of clergy and laity. He may not be agreed with, but he certainly would be treated with respect and gain in future influence. Bishop Ellicott did, in fact, maintain a running line of comment on all the speeches, but the Chairman, of course, was not to be answered.

The Bristol Congress had been closed for about six weeks, when another Church event of the speaking kind came off. In the diocese of Oxford a society with a useful and definite, though not brilliant mission, has for some years been at work, having as its object the raising of funds wherewith to increase the endowments of poor livings within the three counties of which the diocese is composed. The Bishop of Oxford, wishing to give an impulse to the society, borrowed the Sheldonian Theatre for a meeting in the latter half of November, and bespoke a strong cast of speakers, comprising, among others, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Walter, Mr. Beresford Hope, and Mr. Hubbard. There was also Mr. Disraeli,



The other speakers, the Bishop included, confined themselves to a plain and earnest advocacy of the claims of the ill required incumbents; Mr. Disraeli, however, had other objects in view. He has, for some years past, been accustomed to make an occasional rural appearance as a friend of the Church. His arena has, however, been the inn's public room or a national school-room, and his audience a ruri-decanal meeting. Now fortune had thrown in his way the Sheldonian Theatre, with the *élite* of a University and two or three counties as audience. Moreover, the University was the one whose more famous member was the orator who was at once most conspicuously pitted against Mr. Disraeli in public life, and who stands the most conspicuous negation of the absolute identity of Churchmanship and of political fealty to Mr. Disraeli's party. To beat Mr. Gladstone at Oxford would be the *bonne bouche* of a general election, to beat him on a Church cry would be *sauce piquante* to that *bonne bouche*. So Mr. Disraeli is not much to be blamed for having taken a very comprehensive view of the opportunity so luckily dropped into his mouth, while he left the poor clergy to the care of the remaining speakers, and made the Oxford Theatre ring with a manifesto of 'Church policy.' The policy itself is, in most particulars, that which we have ourselves consistently advocated, and its adoption by the English politician who, like Louis Napoleon, with all his astuteness, dreams when he thinks, is a proof how strongly the general atmosphere must be charged with the electricity of Church progress. The speech itself was very ingenious, almost eloquent in parts, and daringly shotted with personal epigram. But perhaps it reads, in passages, better than it sounded. There was a point in the speech where Mr. Disraeli found himself compelled at a sudden turn to inventory the party in the Church whose system is sacramental—the Anglo-Catholics, in a word. A brief but awkward moment of embarrassment resulted in 'there are some who are 'sustained by symbolical ceremonies, and feel that their soul is 'only adequately satisfied by ecclesiastical arrangements of that 'character.' This pronouncement was, on the testimony of the *Guardian*, received with cheers and laughter. The opposite party 'can only be sustained by the ecstasy of spiritual enthusiasm.' But, mildly remarks the statesman, 'as long as they 'who counsel or pursue these modes'—i.e. arrangements and ecstasy—'meet on the common platform of true, sound Church 'principle,' 'I do not think that such a course of conduct is to 'be regretted.' Which course of conduct, the arrangements or the ecstasy? We are not surprised that the advocates of decisive ceremonial are a little disconcerted at the unconscious evidence which this passage affords of Mr. Disraeli's complete want of sym-

pathy for, and innocent ignorance of, their position. A little further on the versatile orator was again visibly getting into the shallows, from a confusion of ideas between 'creeds' and 'articles of faith,' which appeared to be synonymous terms in his mind, as it seemed to cool bystanders. Happily, the present participle came to his rescue, and by aid of 'repudiating creeds and rejecting articles,' the speaker regained his footing, till at last Sidonia himself walked the earth again, 'in the incantations of Canidia and the Corybantian howl.' Finally, warmed by his subject, Mr. Disraeli informed his delighted auditory that whenever these questions have been 'brought before Parliament, 'I have always opposed alterations of creeds, articles, and sub-  
'scriptions.' Flushed with his well-known senatorial triumphs, in which, as the future Macaulay will record, the member for Buckinghamshire has so efficiently resisted the successive attempts of the Liberal party to edit the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds, our erudite theologian then launched into that spirited rebuke, which has echoed through the British islands, of the neological school, man by man, for the unpardonable offence of using for personal ends second-hand information. Far be it from us to take up the cudgels in their vindication. They deserve their castigation, while the most mortifying as well as grotesque feature of it must be, that it fell from those particular lips.

After all, the important question to all good Churchmen in regard to Mr. Disraeli's speech is, what is it worth? It is, as it stands, a bountiful offer, and we have to ask whether the tender is made in coin or in paper. Few, we believe, will attempt to say that it is not in the latter currency; and not many will attempt, if hard pressed, to say that the paper must be taken at other than a considerable discount. So appreciated, we have no hesitation in saying that so outspoken an acknowledgment of the Church's righteous claim to more bishops, a reformed Convocation with lay representation, a settlement of Church rates, better courts, and something done for the Colonial Church, coming from the mouth of the leader of one of the great parties in the House of Commons, is of considerable value, although on the face of it delivered as an electioneering assault upon Mr. Gladstone's headquarters. All we have to say to Churchmen is, that if they mean to derive their advantage from it, they must deal with Mr. Disraeli on their own appraisal, and not let him take them all round at his valuation.

One of Mr. Disraeli's points leads us to remember that a few years ago there was a great and long protracted Church-rate agitation, in which the enemies of that impost, after a series of parliamentary victories, found themselves most mysteriously

driven back and routed. Since then there has been a truce. In sundry new parishes, thanks to a recent judgment of Dr. Lushington, the rate has for the first time been levied; in others an obscure series of fights has gone on; in the greatest number they have been quietly paid; in a minority never thought of; while the 'liberation' faction has sat by in an ominous attitude of sulky silence. Happily, the Church Institution and the dependent societies, in spite of much good will that way on the part of many of their members, have always been induced to pull up at the point of advocating the No-surrender policy, and the Establishment party, comprising leading High and leading Low Churchmen, have never as a whole been compromised to that tenet. We have not shrunk in the time of Church-rate discussion from advocating, as the only possible and one desirable compromise, the exemption of Dissenters, coupled, for those who will pay, with the maintenance of the existing system under renewed legal sanction. To this we adhere in these days of lull. When the storm again rages, we hope the time will not be past to advance that which is now, we feel, a theory of the closet, into a plan of practical adjustment.

The confiscation of the revenues of the Irish Church, a scheme which holds the same place on the platform of the unfettered Liberal as the confiscation of the Maynooth endowment does on that of the unimproved Tory, was for some reason forgotten by Mr. Disraeli. He probably concluded that Oxford would neither feel nor pretend any interest in the sister kingdom. As a political question, there can be no doubt that this confiscation would be a direct and long first step towards breaking down that which all true politicians have for many years been striving to create—a complete assimilation between England and Ireland. In equity, too, the Established Church has held those revenues quite long enough to have set up many Statutes of Limitation; even if she could not prove that she was by episcopal descent the representative of the old Irish Church, as against the antagonistic Romanist hierarchy, descended as that is from a new importation of bishops, hastily consecrated from Rome in place of the former conforming prelates. Besides, as a merely practical question, the revenues are not so very excessive as not to be at least quite as useful in fostering the soil over which they have been so long spread, as they could possibly be if dissipated over a much wider area. Again, what would that wider area be,—the Anglican, Roman, and Presbyterian communities rateably accommodated, or a miscellaneous mob of educationists, philanthropists, and jobbers in general, each jealously clamouring for his share of the plunder? We believe, in a word, that the two confiscations, that of the long held property of the Established Church, and that

of the recently given endowment of Maynooth College, stand on the same footing of impossibility and of unfairness, while we are sure that either would seriously jeopardise the political safety of Ireland itself. English Churchmen in general are, we believe, inclined to look upon the Irish Church as the member of the family which had better never be spoken about. That body has its great faults and shortcomings, and its position as the Church of the minority is the striking evidence of some misconduct or other at some earlier epoch. Yet there is, we believe, a revival of Churchmanship in progress among the Protestants of Ireland, which the Englishman, who is not familiar with the Irish character, would not guess. An Irishman is naturally traditional, and naturally polemical, so that the loud denouncer of Popery, and all that he believes or thinks assimilating to Popery, may often at bottom have an uncultivated store of something very like genuine, though imperfectly developed, Churchmanship, in duty to which he has persuaded himself that he does right in hoisting the No Popery banner. Of all most unexpected forms the Church movement has taken an ecclesiological one in Ireland, and stands confessed in the new cathedrals, built or building, in Kilmore, Cork, and Tuam, not to speak of the one projected for Belfast, and those restored or under restoration at Dublin, Limerick, Kilkenny, Killaloe, and Londonderry. Again, synodical action seems on the point of being advocated in that Church. Whatever Ireland takes up, it takes up rapidly and hotly, so there is no reason why a very decided High Church movement may not be a coming phase of its Anglican population. As it is, the reasons for its actual shortcomings were sketched with a very friendly, but yet fair as well as clever pencil, by Dean Magee, of Cork, in a characteristically but wholesomely high speech which he made at the Bristol Congress.

There is another point, of a character partly doctrinal and partly political, on which we may as well say a few words in this place—the agitation for a reformed system of subscription in the Church of England, which Lord Palmerston very adroitly postponed by the appointment of a Commission of unimpeachable weight and respectability. What its report may be we do not yet know, but enough seems to have oozed out to show that the ostensible grievance will be remedied, a form of subscription of workable stringency introduced, and the hopes of those who expected to enter the ministry of a Church where endowments would count much and faith little, considerably chilled. If so, we shall not say that the Commission met for nothing, little as we like meddling with a Church's belief or practice by way of Commission.

Church Congresses were, as we have seen, a bold experiment in bringing together opposite schools among members of the Church of England. Such societies as those for the benefit of poor livings in Oxford and other dioceses, are organized on a similar but less hazardous system of fusion, in reference to single methods of unpolemical usefulness. Larger and more complex schemes of practical improvement sometimes are and sometimes are not worked conjointly. There are those which are carried on upon the give-and-take principle; while, in other cases, each side has quietly dropped into a tacit understanding to work its own machinery with uncordial peacefulness. A large experiment has, however, been made in that city whose population reckons by millions, and whose area is a province, to introduce the system of friendly compromise into a complicated experiment of manifold aggressive energizing. The Bishop of London's Fund tumbled, there is no doubt, into bigness. Bishop Tait, with great good feeling, called a large select meeting of picked men rather early in 1862, to talk over the spiritual destitution of the metropolis. The men he brought together happened, at the moment, to be full of energy and full of suggestions, and before any one, Bishop or invited, very well knew where he was standing, they all found themselves pledged to a large promise of raising and distributing a grand sum. Since then, this Fund has gone on increasing and modifying itself—perhaps too much so—till, instead of a conduit pipe with a well perforated rose, it has become a species of tribunitiate for overhauling the spiritual concerns of all London north of the Thames. Hitherto, give-and-take have done their work, and, as outside critics, we are bound to note the Fund as a remarkable phenomenon.

In no diocese of England, since Exeter in 1851, has a Diocesan Synod been held; but the idea of the necessity of such institutions is steadily gaining ground, and any irregular gathering of Churchmen is a fresh argument in favour of their orderly revival. Only we trust that the Bishop who convokes the next will have duly weighed the various constitutions that he can give to the body, before endowing it with life. A synod of all the clergy of any diocese would probably be too unwieldy for cool deliberation, and so would sink into a machine for registering the Bishop's determinations. Again: the laity must somehow find their place in the synod, if the institution is intended to secure general acquiescence. How the laity had best be represented in it is a question far too wide for the present discussion. Our own idea is, that some method of representation by orders might be devised, which would be a break upon the more democratic plan of the mere representation of numbers or even of parishes.

From political and practical Church questions, we now pass

on to those which affect doctrine; and first, we have to consider the case of that pernicious volume, the 'Essays and Reviews.' Speaking, in this instance, the individual opinion of the writer of the present article, we must own that we have never felt quite clear and satisfied in our own mind as to the expediency of having made any portion of the book the subject of a judicial prosecution, unless it could have been made abundantly clear before starting that the actual courts would accept and act upon the common law of the Catholic Church. What we mean is that a prosecution under civil common law, is a very different thing from a prosecution contravening the XXXIX. Articles. We owned to the uttermost the scandal and the mischief of that ill-starred and discreditable publication; but, when we had done so, we were driven back to the question with which we started—'Is it needful, and is it expedient, to take up rather than to ignore the offensive publication?' Ignored, it would probably have taken its unobtrusive place in the unnumbered host of clever literary failures. Ignored, it will have been sufficiently judged by the gentlemanly common-sense of the world, which has pronounced, in mess-rooms and in clubs not less than in combination-rooms and in rural deans' parlours, that the men who could have written the obnoxious 'Essays' ought not to have been reckoned among the clergy of the Church of England. Ignored by authority, the 'Essays' might have been crushed by antagonistic logic and learning. No censure was passed, for no censure could have been passed, on Boyle for setting up Phalaris, and yet, by the mere polemical force of Bentley's argument, Boyle stands to all time a literary heretic, condemned past extenuation. In days when either side equally accepted authority, and the only controversy was which authority—Athanasius or Arius, Nicholas or Photius, Tetzels or Luther, Luther or Zwingli—was to prevail, there was no alternative as to fighting out every question. Now that authority is not universally received, while opinion is everywhere respected, as much by those who revere authority into the bargain as by those who do not care for it, it might have been right to ask whether the side which had hitherto been victorious against 'Essays and Reviews' in the equitable court of opinion, was wise to appeal from their own success to the law court of authority. At best, it was a game of double or quits. The judicial condemnation of 'Essays and Reviews' would not make the British public like them worse than they already did; while the punishment of their writers would only evoke that sympathy for the weak man which is so general as well as so generous, though often illogical, a characteristic of the Briton. On the other hand, those that sympathised with the book were just the people who did not care a rush for authority, and who were actively looking



out to catch authority making itself unpopular by passing from the censure of opinions to the oppression (as they would say) of men. So much for success. Failure, on the other hand, might involve the 'rehabilitation' of the Essayists in the eyes of public opinion, as men who had not, after all, acted unhandsomely to the Church in and on which they lived, not to talk of the extent to which the Church itself might or might not be corporately implicated in their false doctrines, if the voice of the Church's tribunal pronounced them 'not guilty.' Moreover, as we have hinted, orthodox men were bound to consider that the weapons which they were preparing to employ had been forged for quite another conflict. It was not clear that the courts could let them fight on the ground of the general conformity of Anglicanism to the Catholic faith. If kept to Anglican formularies, they would have to make the best of certain specific formularies drawn up to meet quite another class of errors in a totally different condition of things.

The analogy of the Gorham case might undoubtedly have been brought as, at least, a plausible *argumentum ad hominem*. But the analogy would really have been worth nothing. In the first place, it must not be forgotten that the Gorham suit was the crucial experiment as to the reliance which the Church had a right to put in the temporal courts when the sustentation of the Catholic Faith was in question. The experiment was fairly tried, and fairly broke down; and we do not see why a burnt Church may not allowably feel as a burnt child is known to do. But the Gorham case, at the stage in which it became a public question, was the direct reverse of that of 'Essays and Reviews.' The original examination and rejection of Mr. Gorham was a matter of private import between the Ordinary and the presentee to Bramford Speke. When the curtain rose, Mr. Gorham was plaintiff, and the Bishop of Exeter defendant, and the summons to the Church party was to rally to the support of the impugned party. In the more modern case, the Essayists (the two, we mean, against whom proceedings were taken) were living upon their incumbencies when the law was invoked to bring them to punishment for their writings. In the Gorham case, at its public stage, the Bishop was defendant, and Mr. Gorham plaintiff. Yet the Bishop failed. In all the subsequent Church *causes célèbres*, with the single exception of the anomalous Heath case, the assailant (whether High Church or Low Church) most impartially broke down. Mr. Westerton broke down against Mr. Liddell, Mr. Ditcher against Archdeacon Denison, and finally (though at a date subsequent to the commencement of the Essays case), the Bishop of Capetown against Mr. Long. Under these conditions Dr. Rowland Williams and Mr. Wilson were brought into court.

In the Arches Court they were condemned to a penalty so trivial, in comparison with the reason for it, as to render justice a mockery and orthodoxy a bye-word. They appealed to the Judicial Committee, and, on appeal, the subject-matter of the contestation was so thoroughly rasped down, as at last to have assumed the shape, not of a judicial inquiry into the doctrines contained in the *Essays* of the two impugned writers, but of the bald question, whether Dr. Williams' and Mr. Wilson's views upon the inspiration of Scripture and the eternity of punishment were so 'economical' as to be beyond the elastic limits of the Articles, interpreted in all the literality of their vagueness. So handicapped, the Cambridge and the Oxford neologian easily won, and their winning was, without doubt, a grievous offence and misfortune to the Church, although the assertion of the alleged truth of Holy Scripture, and of the alleged measure of God's vengeance for sin, dropped from the lips of Lord Chancellor Westbury.

We do not say that those who were responsible for the suit ought to have foreseen this result. It was, as we have stated, a game of double or quits, and quits won. The indignation of Churchmen took a threefold form: Synodical action, a popular movement, and practical reform. The Synodical action, as all know, determined in a condemnation of '*Essays and Reviews*' by the Convocation of Canterbury. It is open to those who demurred at the first to judicial proceedings, to regret that the attempt should have been made to counterbalance the formal, though unsatisfactory, sentence of the Judicial Committee by the indeterminate gravity of a Convocational censure. The Bishop of Ely had the courage, in the Upper House of Convocation, to raise his warning voice against the Committee on whose report the censure was based—a voice in which no one would pretend to find an unorthodox ring—while he protested against the attempt to fight erroneous opinion by inoperative authority. Convocation has not so securely made good its position—it has not so completely proved its equitable right to speak out in its unreformed condition—as to entitle it, without misgiving, to enter on proceedings which could not affect Dr. Williams' or Mr. Wilson's legal status, and could not stop the sale of one copy of these *Essays*, but which might bring down upon Convocation, yet struggling into position, the enmity of powers mightier, if not more righteous, than itself. The Committee of Inquiry was named, their report duly presented, and then the censure founded on that report passed both Houses of Convocation, although the division in the Lower House showed, out of a minority of twenty, such names as those of Archdeacons Thorp, Sandford, Allen, Hale, Hony, Moore, and Lord Arthur Harvey, and of Canons

Blakesley, Harvey, and Selwyn; none, surely, men tainted with suspicion of unbelief. Happily for the credit of the Church, Convocation was not long left in the wrong, if in the wrong it ever was. A few days only elapsed, and it found itself reinstated on the pedestal of moral dignity, strong enough to despise or to forgive the ribald buffoonery with which, from the woolsack, the Lord High Chancellor attacked that venerable institution through its most brilliant member.

A popular movement, which we counted as the second element in the opposition provoked by Lord Westbury's report, on which the Judicial Committee's Judgment was founded, had simultaneously come into play. The first form it took was that of a declaration affirmatory of the doctrines impugned by the Chancellor, which was signed by eleven thousand of the clergy. All that we desire to say of this declaration is, that we are very glad that each signer was not called upon to give his own gloss on the declaration, and that all these glosses were not published in the brochure which recorded the signatures. The idea which undoubtedly underlay a vast number, perhaps a preponderating majority, of the signatures, was one which merited all respect—the notion that whereas the Faith of the Church had sustained damage by the pronouncement of the Judicial Committee, therefore a vast, albeit informal, counter assertion would purge the offence and neutralise the damage. Our own impression is, either that the Church of England cannot have so deeply sinned the sin of Jeroboam as these excellent people believe, or that the remedy which they propose is inadequate to the ill. Either the Essay upon the Essays, delivered by the Chancellor, is parasitical to the Church, or else if it be the formal voice of the Church, informal protests cannot neutralise its venom. We derive our confidence from holding the first position. Openly since the Gorham judgment, implicitly long before, the Church of England has lived a double life. Her ordinal and her formularies insure her orders and sacraments. The Catholic Creeds are hers, and the language of Catholic tradition overflows in her ritual and symbolic writings. This is her inward life. Her outward one, the life of the 'Established Church,' has, to say the least, been a tangle of inextricable inconsistencies; yet the inward life has not been submerged by this complication, but, on the contrary, all adown the times of the greatest entanglement, it has, for the last thirty years, manifested itself in more and more salient demonstrations of tender yet strong vitality.

After all, the theory of this double life is not a greater difficulty, we should be almost inclined to say that it was a less one, than that of Anglicanism itself, viewed in its most characteristic aspect of the assertion of the possibility of an outwardly

divided Catholic Church. The Roman assault on our position always begins, and often ends, with the denial of that possibility. Our rejoinder is that its possibility proves itself by facts. Such a premise must be fertile in conclusions, and these conclusions can hardly tend in the way of unity. We beg that we may not be misunderstood. A divided Christendom, or a national Church with variances between its inward and its outward life, are equally misfortunes. But they are misfortunes which must be faced and accepted by the man who holds to the English Church, nothing wavering. When England is on its trial as against Rome, or Greece, or Irvingism, or that *ignis fatuus* a 'Free Church,' other considerations come in; but 1850 ought to have taught Churchmen the dangers of choosing their physicians from men who are experimenting on the vitality of the body which they are professing to cure.

The contrast of the inward and the outward lives was not unmanifest during the past summer in the pastorals with which the two Archbishops addressed the Church and the public, in free criticism, well argued and congruously framed, upon the Judgment. The publication of these documents led to the preparation of an address of thanks to the primates for their really excellent publications. The address was, as far as its terms went, quite unexceptionable, and it received at first starting the signatures of persons who concluded that it was to be confined to the select few who might be supposed to have some reasonable comprehension of the writings on either side. But no sooner was this nucleus of names obtained, than the document was sown broadcast through the land, addressed to clergymen and to churchwardens, to gather up all or any signatures of men or women who might be induced to thank the archbishops for issuing two brochures, which many of them never had read, nor meant to read, and could not understand if they did read them, in reply to obnoxious writings which they equally never had and never meant to read, and, if they did read them, could not understand. How many doubts this fresh advertisement of the Essays might raise to one which it could allay, never seems to have occurred to the promoters. However, 137,000 signatures were obtained—no great number, if it really were that crucial movement for Christianity itself, which the promoters seemed to assume—and the Archbishops received and replied to the memorialists in speeches in which the practical and wise advice to live down Essayist infidelity by unwearying zeal in the missionary work of the Church shone out conspicuous.

It was natural that the Judicial Committee, being the *fons et origo* of the scandals and troubles, should have provoked attention to its own composition, and to the possibility of practical

remedy for the future in the way of its reform. The same phenomenon took place after the Gorham judgment, but there the aggrieved party was not so numerous as in the present instance. As we have shown, the weakness of the moral obligation of the Church to believe in the Judicial Committee is the Church's gain. The reformers of the Court of Appeal will do well to see that their most praiseworthy efforts do not end in the formation of a Court of Appeal which, while it may be strong enough to demand compliance, is yet not so strong as to secure conviction for its dicta, nor so learned as to ensure the orthodoxy of those dicta. It must never be lost sight of, that infallibility is nowhere promised to any national Church in its collective form, and still less to its selected delegates. The weak side of the present demand of course is, that it comes from the party which has, however unrighteously, been beaten. However much the plea may be ostensibly and honestly one for a better form of Appellate Court, the *subaudito*, will always be felt, 'and one which may one of these days undo Lord Westbury's mischief.' If a new Court accordingly could be formed, and if it should happen some day to have to reconsider the same questions, and that the improved tribunal were to disown that Lord Westbury had so cunningly fenced round his dicta as to have them formally unassailable in law, the Church indeed might, as a formal corporation, be the better for its new Court, but the authority of Lord Westbury's aberrations would be strengthened. We hope from the bottom of our heart that the intimations so plentifully cast about, of making this new Court a hustings' cry, and of strengthening that cry by general discussions of the deep doctrines involved in the Chancellor's report, were merely the strong ejaculations of wounded feeling. To those who appreciate how awfully solemn these questions are, and who have any acquaintance with the moral quality of electioneering, even at the best, the notion was indescribably painful. Even if such a cry were to succeed, its success would have been secured by throwing treasures, which ought for ever to have been reverently guarded, into the mire of the crowded street; it would have been an attempt to bolster up authority by an appeal to the most ignorant and most democratic form of mere opinion. Whispers, also, have occasionally been heard of a 'Free Church,' in default of a new Court. We are convinced that the idea has no more vitality about it than the similar one in 1850. In the mean while, its ventilation is an unmixed misfortune, especially when supported by gentlemen so sanguine as those who expect to be allowed to carry their Churches over with them.

The audacity of the Essayists was left far behind by the reckless

and obtrusive Jacobinism of Bishop Colenso. Happily, the preface with which, after the manner of the 'Arabian Nights,' he produced his intelligent Zulu, as the cause of the subsequent narrative, went far, by its naïve absurdity, to counteract much of the possible mischief of the ponderous lucubration. Still, the book was a scandal and an outrage, as well as a misfortune to the whole Christian Church, and the Bishop of Capetown deserves the thanks of all honest people for having taken energetic steps, in concert with his comprovincials, to release the diocese of Natal from the superintendence of its bewildered Bishop. The adequate cause, all things considered, existed there, in that centre of missionary work among the heathen, as it hardly did in the case of the two country incumbents who are resting under Lord Westbury's ægis. But he had more than one way of acting. He has adopted the one which leaves the question at this moment to be solved by the always recurring Judicial Committee. This, of course, leads us anxiously to inquire how far Bishop Gray has been careful to maintain the due distinction between those spiritual attributes which Dr. Colenso was very certain never to get any court in England to reimpose upon Natalese or Zulus, and that tenure of his freehold in a queen-given bishopric, considered as a mere property, irrespective of ecclesiastical considerations, of which the court might naturally constitute itself the guardian. The Bishop had himself, not long before, sustained a defeat under rather similar circumstances, at the hands of Mr. Long. Mr. Long might have been to any extent contumacious, but the Judicial Committee held that the Bishop was not within his powers in interfering with his incumbency. It would have been dexterous policy in the Bishop of Capetown to have swung himself round into the position which Mr. Long had himself made for him, and left Dr. Colenso on the pavement of Whitehall, enjoying the temporalities of a despiritualised office. Had the Bishop, with his assessors, declared that Bishop Colenso's aberrations had rendered him unfit to exercise his duties until he had repented of those heresies, and had in consequence released his clergy from their allegiance to him, and delegated himself, as metropolitan, to undertake the supervision of the diocese of Natal until Dr. Colenso had made his recantation, we believe that he would have placed himself and the Church in that colony in a position, which might perhaps be, technically speaking, a little irregular, but which would be unassailable by any court, colonial or imperial. Of course we assume (as facts have since shown to be the case) that the metropolitan could rely on the Clergy of Natal to go with him. The fact that the Colonial Church, as an institution, has grown up simultaneously with,



though independently of, that theory of responsible government in colonies which successive colonial secretaries have worked up, it is well, for reasons of expediency, never to be too eager to bring the patents of colonial dioceses under the scrutiny of jealous tribunals; more we might say, but *adhuc sub judice lis est*, and we forbear.

Happily, no other colony has been disturbed by a doctrinal conflict. The Australian Church, as far as we can gather, seems holding its own, and a little more, without signal successes or signal reverses, founding here and there a new diocese, and completing works such as Sydney Cathedral. In New Zealand itself, missionary work, in face of the sad war now raging, must pretty well be at a standstill; not so, we trust, Bishop Patteson's labours in the dark islands. The Canadian Church is quietly consolidating itself under the metropolitical rule of the Bishop of Montreal. As far as we can gather, the Diocese of Huron is the only antipathetic element in the province. We conclude that the fusion of British America into a political federation will be sooner or later followed by the adhesion of the dioceses of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland, to Bishop Fulford's province. The Bishopric of British Columbia is, we trust, itself the germ of another province, and already the formation of a second Bishopric within its limits is under discussion. Of the Central African Mission, embalmed as it is in the memory of Mackenzie, we do not see our way to speak at length. There is a new Bishop and a new start, and this start has the advantage, which is as important in spiritual as in military strategics, of a base of operations. A confirmatory illustration of this truth has come to hand from another corner of the mission field. Every one knows that Great Britain holds in fee a small dependent island of Borneo, called Labuan, and that Great Britain has moreover great social, if not political, influence in the mainland of the island through the acquisition by Sir James Brooke of the vassal lordship of the district of Sarawak. Every one ought also to know that the Church of England has followed up this arrangement by the mission of a Bishop, who is on one side a diocesan of the Colonial Church as Bishop of Labuan, and on the other the head of an independent Church in communion with the English Church within the principality of Sarawak. The appointment of the Bishop of Sarawak under the seal of Rajah Brooke was as formal as that of the Bishop of Labuan by Queen Victoria.

Bishop Macdougall is too practical a man not to have realized the advantages and the peculiarities of his double position. Finding his mission ripe for decisive action, he held, on the last

23d of May, a Synod of the Diocese of Sarawak, at which, besides himself, six clergymen were present; no large number, but enough to debate and to legislate. The proceedings, of course, began by an address from the Bishop, in which he pointed out that, 'as a complete Missionary Church in a foreign territory, we are free to act for ourselves.' The use which Bishop Macdougall makes of this freedom is to pronounce that, 'as Bishop of Labuan I am subject to the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, and as Bishop of Sarawak I consider myself under the same patriarchal jurisdiction.' What the synod had to do was to organise a provisional form of constitution for the diocese; and, 'among the matters which it was desirable to take first in hand, were forms of shorter services for daily use in Dyak Churches,' as well as forms of prayer and thanksgiving for seed and harvest time, together with 'rules of penance and discipline, with some suitable form for the public admonition of offenders and the readmission of penitents to communion.' Further on the Bishop observes: 'I hope the day is not far distant when our synod will be enlarged, not only by the addition of fresh clergymen, but also of good and pious laymen who take an interest in our work.' This synod, so convened, sat for three days, and the chief practical results of its deliberations were the ordering of a preparation, 'from the Anglican Prayer-book, of an Order for Common Prayer for the use of Dyak Churches,' comprising the special preparation of a Preface to the Order of Confirmation 'to be used at the confirmation of persons baptized as adults,' the appointment of a Committee (a specially wise step) to 'agree on certain theological terms to be used in all translations, and an inquiry into the pre-existent customs of the tribes among whom the Missionaries were working. The Church of Sarawak is a very small one, but its recent action has been so wise as to deserve particular notice as a model of catholic and sensible missionary regulation. Humanly speaking, its Bishop could not have done what he has done without the base of operations which he possesses. It is much to be hoped that that base may be widened and strengthened by the transfer to him of Singapore, with its large and wealthy, civilized and European population, and its spacious church, and its well-ordered system, as the future seat of his see—a change loudly demanded at Singapore itself by Churchmen and Presbyterians alike. If Singapore be hopeless, then Penang would also be an excellent centre. In the case of the mission to Honolulu, the antecedent civilization of the Sandwich Islands, their imperfect Christianization, and the royal power, together furnished the base. For a moment the king's death seemed to have thrown all back; but his brother and successor, an abler, we imagine,

though hitherto not so devoted a man, seems thoroughly inclined to follow in his predecessor's footsteps.

Church matters in the United States have, to the casual English reader, passed under a cloud since the *Guardian's* correspondent has been pleased to fill his inkhorn with blood. Now and then news of good omen reaches us, as when we hear that Dr. Coxe has been elected Assistant-Bishop of Western New York, or that, in spite of Bishop Potter's high-and-dry opposition, the New York Convention has been discussing the division of dioceses and the provincial system. At other times, English Churchmen are pained and humiliated to hear of eminent Churchmen, of whom they expected better things, giving the public *accolade* to the brutal and 'infamous' Butler. Next autumn the triennial Convention will reassemble, and we hope that it may separate after a legislative session spent in something more useful than the lengthened word fights of 1862. Of the Church in the Confederate States we know still less; but, without precise information, we may make sure that the Clergy and the members of that Church are strengthening and ennobling their countrymen in their glorious struggle.

It would be a great oversight on our part if we were not to make some reference to the crisis through which our Church in Scotland has passed, and which has resulted, on the one hand, in the revision of its canons, and, on the other, in the tardily granted repeal of the prohibitory enactments with which the government of George II. was pleased to punish its faithful loyalty to the Stuarts, by refusing privileges which the converted Roman Catholic priest can claim for himself. All in all, that Church has full reason to be thankful, though not to rest. The Scottish Eucharistic Office is, to be sure, deposed from its status of 'primary authority,' which it would have been difficult to have sustained, but it is authorized nevertheless, and thus the Anglican Church still enjoys throughout all its branches the advantage of possessing within its communion, though rarely and locally used, a form of liturgy in which the primitive and catholic doctrine is so grandly enounced, in words which, from not being identical with those of our own Prayer-book, are on that very account valuable as a support and an explanation of the English Use.

We may be asked, Do you, then, who favour this breach of absolute identity between the English and the Scottish Prayer-books, and who quote with approbation the reforming resolutions of the Sarawak Synod, acquiesce, as in consistency bound, in the agitation of those who, truly alleging the normal imperfection of human things, wish to see whether the 'Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments' cannot be mended? Our answer to this plea is, as the lawyers would say,

by way of demurrer,—We refuse to entertain the question itself until we find that it is put by an authority which comes into court with legitimate credentials to act as our interrogator. The agitation for Prayer-book reform has not always been prompted by any real, simple desire to improve the book in its literary character, to make it more practically sound and useable, or to import into it a deeper and wider learning. Undisguisedly it has, from first to last, been a dodge of the party which is bent upon excising or cutting down the assertion of sacramental doctrine which runs through the formularies of the Church of England. From crochetty Mr. Bingham, downwards, all the reformers harp on that string. They may have been a little too early outspoken in the way they have shown what part of the Prayer-book it is which they dislike, but they evince much worldly wisdom in agitating for a change in the formularies. Their conviction is, that the party which will, by the laws that govern all great revolutions, be almost certain to win, if the lines of the *status in quo* be given up, must be themselves, and not the persons who are enthusiastic enough to imperil that *status in quo* in hopes of attaining something more catholic. The catholicity of the existing Church of England, explicit or implicit, is, we believe, quite strong enough to keep the book, as it is, afloat: it is not strong enough to guide it through a revision.

We do not for a moment pretend to say that we think the Prayer-book is perfect—we have our own notions as to the points in which it might be improved. For example, it would be all the better if it possessed some special service for Christmas Eve, proper psalms and a proper preface for the Epiphany, lessons for Ash-Wednesday, and psalms for other days in Holy Week than merely Good Friday. But we are not so enamoured of the policy of 'coming and being killed,' that, for the chance of carrying these and maybe other alterations, we should risk turning over the book to the tender mercies of Lord Ebury and his compeers. We have little doubt that, when the *mêlée* came, other persons would flock in, whose projects of catholic modification far outran ours. The prospects of success for their claims would be *nil*; but not so their influence for harm. Their plans would set up John Bull's No-Popery susceptibilities, and thus their urgency would assuredly play the game of the ultra-Protestant innovators. The present Prayer-book is a compromise, binding both Church and State; and holding it to be a compromise, we refuse, as the world now is, to have its contents opened up within the limits of the English and Irish Establishments; although in countries such as Sarawak, where the Establishment 'runneth not,' and where the liturgical legislators act from practical and not polemical motives, we warmly welcome any serious

endeavour to adapt it to the wants of a heathen population. The more elastic employment of our actual formularies, especially the now universal recognition of the separate use of the Litany and of the Eucharistic service, is sufficient for the present necessity; and it behoves impatient reformers on either side to try a little longer and a little harder what they can do by those simple means, before they busy themselves to pull down the house under which they have so long rested.

We feel the inexpediency of touching the Prayer-book so strongly, that we are inclined to stand aghast at the facility with which the Archbishop of Canterbury, generally so cautious, threw on the floor of the House of Lords, without consultation with his brethren, or with the remaining clergy or laity of the Church, a promise to open up the Table of Lessons. We are not afraid to say why we are frightened at this movement. We do not think that the selections from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, or Ezekiel are absolutely the best chapters that could be chosen, or that there is any conclusive reason for throwing out Chronicles and the Song of Songs. But we should look upon it as a great misfortune to the Church of England if the use of the Apocrypha in her public worship were to be called into question. The Apocrypha is the Apocrypha, and the books contained in it are Deuterocanonical. All parties agree to that. Then comes the divergence. The innovationists protest that, because they are so, they should be made sealed books to the Christian congregation. The more conservative minded Churchman looks to his Thirty-Nine Articles, and desires, like S. Jerome and the English Church, still to have them 'read for example of life and instruction of manners.' It is nobody's business to settle the precise value of that most venerable collection. It is sufficient to say that the Universal Church has ever rated that volume very highly—in some portions of it, and in later times, too highly; that the Church of England in her lectionary orders the Apocrypha to be read, and in her Articles of Religion gives an excellent reason why that reading should take place. To expunge the Apocrypha now would be wilfully to dis sever a link between our own actual Church and the purer Church of undivided Christendom. Is it, then, cowardice for us to say that we are sorry to see the *status in quo* of the lectionary given up in face of a fanatical party, which is openly and vehemently clamouring for the condemnation of the Apocrypha?

We have imperceptibly found ourselves drifting into the consideration of the ritual side of Church prospects. This leads us to our last topic, the sensational movement. It may not unreasonably be guessed, that we do not intend to let this section pass without venturing some opinion upon the doings of the

*soi-disant* Brother Ignatius. Before, however, we come to him, we have one or two points which we must note. First, we venture to give a couple of extracts from the 'Notitia Liturgica,' appended to 'The Union Review Almanack, an Ecclesiastical Kalendar for the Year of Grace, 1865':—'On Sundays and festivals, incense should be used at evensong during the singing of the *Magnificat*. This canticle—a daily memorial of the Incarnation—being its' (evensong's, we suppose) 'special feature, some of those who are taking part in the service should indicate this by gathering together in front of the altar while it is being chanted, taking up for the time being such a position as that described here.' Then follows a diagram indicating, among other points, the 'priest officiating' before the altar, as if he were celebrating, two 'acolytes,' and the 'lectern (facing East)' with two 'cantors' at it, besides choristers. This is followed by directions for a 'silent' benediction, with threefold crossings of the incense, and the incensing of the altar, as features of the *Magnificat*. There is something grandiose and scenic in the audacious un-wisdom of this recommendation; but what are we to say to the following in the directions for baptism?—'The violet stole is assumed at the commencement, and laid aside for the *white* stole immediately before the prayer for blessing the water.'

We are not so vain as to dream of influencing the clergy who use such observances, of which we have only given two examples, to a conviction of the peril of the game which they are playing. We do not flinch from the reproaches which may be cast upon us for warning them of it. When men are blind, daylight comes in vain, and the promoters of this ritual are blind to those elements of the actual character of the Englishman, which make him shrink from and fear the minute and the 'tinsel,' as he would call it, while willingly welcoming the stately and the reverential in the worship of Almighty God. Sensational ritual is a direct invitation to a popular outbreak, such as that which disgraced St. George's-in-the-East, and, as is usual in such cases, those who are no way responsible will be sure to suffer in the confusion. But even if an outbreak should be staved off, these proceedings will assuredly, if not intentionally create (if, indeed, it be not more correct to say that they are created by) a sectarian spirit in those who substitute sensation for the simple and legitimate working out of existing forms and rubrics. The churches in which such worship as we have quoted is conducted—the churches in which the afternoon 'litany' is stuffed and overlaid by some other litany, taken straight from a Latin original, and publicly sung in defiance of Church order and the Act of Uniformity—may be assemblies of devout men, as certainly they are not Roman Catholic or Greek Churches. But in spirit



they are only to a modified degree limbs of the great English Church.

If they go on in quiet, which is possible, their doing so may be but a proof of that relaxation of order which is not the least alarming token of the present condition of the English Church. Possibly the strain which saves them from molestation may be itself a wrench to the already weakened cords, while they owe their own impunity to a frame of mind which tolerates and applauds priests of our Church joining with hot-headed laymen and nonconformists, preaching in Antinomian rhapsodies, upon the stages of the minor theatres and in the orchestras of dancing saloons. No break of order, no dodging with the spirit or the letter of an existing regulation can ever be perpetrated, without thereby affording a precedent to those who desire to break that order and dodge those formularies in another direction. Nor can we blame them if they see and take their advantage.

It is far from our wish to counsel any timid repudiation of ritualism. It is because we believe that ritualism is the natural law of the English Church's worship, and because we believe that Englishmen are coming round to that conviction far more extensively and far more completely than we could have thought possible some years since, that we regret the blindness of those who would drive back this happy tendency by overlaying the legitimate ritual of our Church with a mass of startling observances, which to the common mind speak nothing but Rome. What we desire to see in general use would be a code of ritual, of which the salient features should be (1) the adoption of musical modulation (we use the term in its largest sense) as far as practicable in all parts of Divine Service which are not lessons or exhortations, as the most congruous accents wherewith to approach the footstool of Heaven; (2) the antiphonal method of performing the choral service, involving of course surplices, and the use of the chancel as the 'clerks' place; and, (3) at the Eucharistic celebration, the eastward posture of the celebrant, with due subordination in the place of his assistants—the whole encased in churches to any degree (for Englishmen will gladly accept substantial æsthetics) beautiful in architecture, rich in material, ornate with fresco, mosaic, carving, and stained glass.

Such a ritual as this, so framed in the pile which is consecrated to its use, is a worthy offering of man's devotion to his Lord. Such a ritual shows forth completely, though not elaborately, that Incarnation, of which the Sacraments, in their full significance, fully recognised, are the appointed complement. More than that may be beautiful, may be symbolical, may be touching, may be popular with the few, but it is not essential,

nor is it practical towards the conversion or the growth in grace of the millions whom, first of all, we have to look to in our own generation.

We say this, well aware that it may be retorted on us, that all which is now being carried out in the most pronounced churches, is but the filling up of the picture foreshadowed in such works as the '*Hierurgia Anglicana*,' nay, that the pages of the '*Hierurgia Anglicana*' contain startling evidence that ritual of what would now be considered the most impossible description, had been in occasional use in the early days of the Reformed Church of England. We should not shrink from the challenge, while, as to its personal side, we should observe that growth in the perception of the possible among writers who did not wait to be old to take up the pen, is not tergiversation. As to its historical truth it is a fact that such ritual did once prevail, how extensively is not the question. But it prevailed, with several other things likewise, the end of all being that an Archbishop went to the scaffold on Tower Hill, and a King at Whitehall, and that when King and Bishop were brought in triumph back, the Churchmen of the second Caroline era—even the grand relics of the older time, such as John Cosin—seemed with one consent to drop ritual like a hot coal, content, in their wisdom or their apprehensions, to preserve the Prayer-book. The ritual with which we close may be bald compared with that of Elizabeth's, or Andrewes', or Laud's chapel, but it is sumptuous alongside of that which contented Jeremy Taylor, Sancroft, or Ken. It is, moreover, we venture to say, incommensurably better than either as a whole, when the standing accompaniments of the structure, as churches may now be built, in their art and in their arrangements, are taken into account.

We believe that the thing which in some people's eyes most hopelessly stamps the parish priest as 'not going far enough,' is his not lighting the candles at Holy Communion. We have no intention of saying one word on the abstract beauty, significance, or desirableness of the rite; what we have to urge absolves us from handling that topic. The fact is, that those who held the procurator of ritual-loving Churchmen, as managers of the famous Liddell and Westerton suit, early in the case, and with the consent of those they represented, gave up this lighting to save the candlesticks. Dr. Lushington's Judgment, in the lowest Court, went all against them in every particular, except the grudging non-prohibition of the chancel screen, and the allowance of candles on the Lord's Table, provided they were not lighted, except when actually wanted for light. The managers, after grave consideration, felt bound to accept this latter measure of success, rather than, by asking for more, risk losing the whole in an appeal the

success of which was so very doubtful. So Dr. Lushington's Judgment on these points was closed with: the rest, being appealed against, went to the Arches Court, to meet with a second defeat; and then to the Judicial Committee, with what success is now matter of history. Bystanders might differently appraise the legal value of this incident, but those who were personally connected with it are fairly committed to uphold it in its integrity. In other respects a judgment which has exalted the cross in its place of honour, fenced the chancel, accepted the recognition of the Christian seasons in the changed altar vestments, and restored the table of prothesis to our sanctuaries, stands out a solid gain to the orthodox side.

Since this important settlement the Church has made good its advantage in another field where success might have seemed least likely, the general and semi-authoritative adoption of a hymnal, embodying, along with popular modern productions, translations of the masterpieces of the collective hymnology of the Western Church from the earliest ages. Twenty-seven years ago Dr. Newman, still firm in his allegiance to the Church of England, wrote, in a preface to a collection of Latin hymns, extracted from the Paris Breviary:—

'Our Church, with the remarkable caution which she displays so often, has not attempted it. She has received the Psalms and Songs from Scripture; and, rejecting the Roman hymns, has substituted in their stead, not others, but a metrical version of the Psalms. This abstinence has led on the one hand to some of her members on their own responsibility supplying the deficiency, and has incurred the complaint of others who argued that she ought to have taken on herself what, being right in itself, will certainly be done by private hands, if not by the fitting authority. But in truth, when it was necessary for her to abandon those she had received, nothing was left to her but to wait till she should receive others, as in the course of ages she had already received, by little and little.

'We began the world again. This is the proper answer to inconsiderate complaints and impatient interference. There have before now been divines who could write a Liturgy in thirty-six hours. Such is not our Church's way. She is not the empiric to make things to order, and to profess to anticipate the course of nature, which, under grace, as under Providence, is slow. She waits for that majestic course to perfect in its own good time, what she cannot extort from it; for the gradual drifting of precious things upon her shore, now one and now another, out of which she may complete her rosary and enrich her beads, beads and rosary more pure and true than those which at the command of duty she flung away.'

Now-a-days the churches in which 'Hymns, Ancient and Modern,' are in use, are absolutely innumerable, and the publisher boasts that he has sold a million copies, while some of the translations, such as 'Jerusalem the Golden,' have *per saltum* taken their places among our classics by the side of the old familiar Christmas and Easter hymns. Too much praise cannot be given for this success to Mr. Neale, who is notoriously the chief

translator of the ancient hymns (mostly adapted from the 'Hymnal Noted' of the Ecclesiological Society), which have sprung into vogue. Still, the soil must have been prepared to receive the seed, or else it never would have germinated so rapidly. If to the churches where the ritual is altogether correct, be added those in which modified reforms have been adopted, such as chancels properly fitted though not properly used, or else filled with unvested choirs, and those in which, while all other things are satisfactory, the officiator occupies a sideward prayer-desk; if, too, the structural and decorative beauty, enhanced, restored, or given from county to county, to churches old and new, under all conceivable circumstances, be reckoned up, it will not be too much to say that the worship of the English Church is undergoing a silent revolution.

That, however, which is hardest to find in the best appointed church is the one thing which, in its distinctive simplicity, is really of the deepest importance—the eastward posture of the celebrant, showing forth (as his predecessors of all times have done) the Lord's death till He come; not presiding, as a Zwinglian minister, at the head of a table spread for a mere 'love-feast.' We venture to suggest to those who are so eager to group the singers of the Magnificat in a *tableau vivant*, and to change stoles during the baptismal service, that it would be a less sensational, but a far more useful task, quietly to co-operate in inducing the clergy of England throughout the land to acquiesce in the adoption of that attitude at the most solemn moment of the most sacred rite, which alone coincides with the traditions of the Catholic Church, and alone corresponds with the teachings of the ordinal which they are working out. The timid Churchman, who is doubtful where to stand at the prayer of consecration, will certainly not be won to the right position by the perusal of the 'Union Review Almanack.'

The sensation movement in the Church of England reaches its climax in the proceedings of that active young deacon, Mr. Leycester Lyne, who calls himself Brother Ignatius, and signs 'O. S. B.' How Mr. Lyne dresses, and what his pretensions are, we need not fill out our pages to detail, for he is one of the lions of the day. Supposing that he could have excited himself up to the conviction that a revival of monasticism *tout cru* was the likeliest method of working a missionary enterprise in the Church of England, we cannot understand the logical process by which Mr. Lyne persuaded himself that he ought to be, or that he could be, a Benedictine. The Benedictine order is, by many centuries, the oldest existing corporation in the world—at least, if we except the college of Cardinals, who have so far deviated, as the Benedictines have not done, from their primi-

tive constitution. This venerable body has its visible centre at Monte Cassino; its rules, method of admission, tenets, and work, cut out. Gregory and Austin were Benedictines. A man may like the Benedictines, and he may, if he thinks it wise, imitate them, but, unless he belongs to the genuine corporation, he has no more right to put O. S. B. after his name, than he has to sign himself 'Alderman.' But to let this pass: Mr. Lyne wears gracefully the habit of the order to which he does not belong, he is good-tempered; and he has shown, by his *debât* at the Bristol Church Congress, that he possesses the talents of a ready, though not a deep, popular speaker—a fact which he evinced by the adroitness with which he filled so much of his allotted ten minutes with a picture of the spiritual needs of our great towns, which would have been about as appropriate in the mouth of an advocate of theatre-preaching or of a ranter's revival, as in that of a pseudo-Benedictine. Consequently, he has been able to realize a certain amount of evanescent popularity, or, at all events, of toleration, which other pioneers of Church extremes, such as Mr. Brian King, have, from their deficiency in the arts of conciliation, been totally unable to compass. One reason for this may be found in the fact that, whereas they all along professed, and honestly though unwisely strove, to keep within the *littera scripta* of Church law, however obsolete or unworkable, Mr. Lyne has fairly kicked over the traces and stands on a system which has for its foundation the repudiation of all precedent, order, or law, except the fiat of the 'Superior' of the English Benedictine 'order.' The bare statement of his position will absolve us from the imputation of having put the case too strongly against him. Mr. Lyne is in deacon's orders only, not merely being no priest as yet, but never, we believe, a candidate for priest's orders. He is casually resident in the diocese of a Bishop whose licence he has never held, and who has placed him under an inhibition. He has brought round him a very small knot of young men, several of whom, we imagine, are still in the eyes of the law infants, and he has become, together with his companions, occupant of a house in Norwich, the see of the inhibiting prelate, within a parish, whose incumbent, we fancy, he has never consulted. No doubt the occupants of a house can, within their own walls, dress as they like, say what prayers they like, and call themselves Benedictines or Bonzes as they please. So long as they keep their own doors shut on themselves they influence only each other, and they will be reckoned at their own value by outside public opinion; but when a knot of gentlemen, calling themselves Benedictines, without even so much as a priest belonging to their community able to claim orders (though they be but orders without juris-

diction), throw open a chapel fitted up within that house to the general world, for the constant celebration of a novel and an unauthorized system of public worship, partly, we hear, composed of an extravagant representation of the Eucharistic Office of the Church of England,<sup>1</sup> partly of an edited revival of the Benedictine Breviary, and partly, and lastly, of the introduction of one of the most unprimitive rites of modern Romanism—a rite which cannot be used in the Church of England without direct violation of the existing formularies—the ‘Benediction of’ (*i.e.* by) ‘the’ (necessarily reserved) ‘Blessed Sacrament’—then, we say, that Mr. Lyne and his friends are not in a position in which they can claim the silent forbearance of those Churchmen whose wish and whose work is, by patience and prudence, no less than by straightforwardness, to preserve, to strengthen, and transmit the Church of England, with its collective doctrines and Catholic worship, unimpaired.

Mr. Lyne bespoke the sympathies of Churchmen at Bristol on the score of the practical character of his work; and Lord Harrowby mildly responded with the question, ‘Why run the ‘risk of making this work unpopular and unfruitful by the unwonted and startling garb in which you perform it?’ But we distinctly say, that this claim can only be accepted with great allowances in face of devotions so lengthy and so exhausting (involving the night offices, with ‘1 A.M.’ set down as the hour for rising) as those in which the Norwich fraternity indulges. It is an historical fact, that the vast and complicated structure of worship, which in an abridged form was therefore termed the Breviary, was the product of ages in which printing was unknown and newspapers unthought of. With their marvellous interchange of Scripture, fathers, and memoirs, of Psalm and hymn, of versicle and antiphon, these services were a body of literature as much as a system of worship. They were the literature which suited the capacities and the antecedents of those good unlettered folk who for so many centuries formed the staple of the Benedictine body. No doubt the features of these services which are doctrinally most objectionable, are, on the other hand, in a literary point of view, picturesque contrasts to the rest. In short, as, century after century, the Breviary deteriorated in catholicity, it became more abundant in the poetic element—may we be allowed to say, in sensationism? True to its principle of never owning a change if it can help it, Rome, (except during a brief moment of reform under Quignonius’ inspiration) has never in so many words confessed that the age of general literature had antiquated the earlier and more lengthy

<sup>1</sup> We give the most moderate interpretation of the ‘daily mass,’ but it *may* be the Benedictine mass itself.



worship. But in its practice Rome has made brief work with the Breviary, by the allowance of anticipation, lumping, private recitation, and so forth; while the modern counterparts of the old orders, such as the Society of the Jesuits and the Congregation of the Oratory, enjoy immunity from the formal and continued use of the Breviary. We can, therefore, call it nothing short of absurdity for a set of self-willed youths to revive such usages in the English Church, and then go out begging for help because the English alleys are surging with vice and ignorance.

We are not talking without book in our description of Mr. Lyne's ritual observances. We have before us two newspapers, one of which contains a programme by the 'Brother' himself, the other a long description of the life and services in 'S. Mary and S. Dunstan's Priory,' by an enthusiastic visitor, fenced by a somewhat faint disclaimer of responsibility from the editor. Mr. Lyne puts down the 'Convent Mass' for 9.15 A.M. which the visitor describes as 'celebrated in the prescribed vestments, and with every possible ritual adjunct.' It will be noted that this is not the daily Communion of Mr. Hillyard's church of S. Lawrence, by inhibiting which the Bishop of Norwich put himself so thoroughly in the wrong, but a daily Eucharist celebrated in Mr. Lyne's own chapel, but open to the world, under, we conclude, the ordinary jurisdiction of the 'Superior' himself, certainly under no other. Mr. Lyne, it must not be forgotten, is only a deacon, his companions laymen, where, then, does he find the celebrant? This the papers keep prudently in the dark, and if we could we should not attempt to find it out. It is sufficient for us to know that Mr. Lyne himself publishes to the world, through the newspapers, the fact of the daily 'mass,' and on that we have no hesitation in saying that somebody or somebodies of higher order than the diaconate must have very eccentric ideas on the subject of mission and of canonical obedience. We confess to considerable pleasure at having seen in the papers the other day that Deacon Marchmont, if he is a Deacon, was had up before a London magistrate for conducting a very ritualistic and elaborate service, without holding the licence either of an Anglican clergyman or of a dissenting minister. To be sure, Mr. Marchmont added the profanity, of which we do not believe Mr. Lyne could be capable, of himself pretending to consecrate the Holy Eucharist. But, as a matter of Church order, we do not see how the public but unauthorized services of Deacon Lyne are one whit more defensible than those of Deacon Marchmont, who himself, be it noted, takes up the ritualistic side, although, we gather, confining himself to the Prayer-book service. Mr. Lyne's services are, we distinctly say, not claustral and not intended to be claustral. He boasts of the con-

gregation which throngs his services being '800, who would be many more if there were room for them.' Why, then, his admirers will say, hinder what is so manifestly the Lord's work? In reply, we have only to say that, being members of the Church of England, we do not and we cannot see our way to clergy of that Church flying in the face of its plainest laws in view of any supposed expediency. The theatre preachings have been crowded, but we are unable to applaud them; Mr. Marchmont has, we believe, been very popular, yet we denounce him. It is said that we ought to take warning by the mistake made by the Bishops in Wesley's case. Mr. Lyne is exactly inverting John Wesley's career. Wesley began by converting tens of thousands to a religious life, and afterwards defied all Church order, and spurned all Church authority. Mr. Lyne begins where Wesley ended, for we have yet to learn his successful missionary work in the colliery or the crowded alleys.

But to return to the 'Priory.' The visitor tells us—

'On Saturday I was privileged to be at one of the most striking services I ever witnessed; namely, the weekly Benediction of the most Holy Sacrament. This is held on Saturday evening, the Superior told me, because, being an evening when it is difficult for most persons to come to service, only those who really are devout will take the trouble to come, and the Blessed Sacrament is thus not exposed to a crowd of irreverent gazers. The chapel was quite full of almost exclusively the faithful. Numbers had brought simple bouquets of flowers to adorn the altar, and it was a very pleasing sight to see them present their offerings, one after the other, to the Superior, who twice had to leave the chapel with his arms loaded with bouquets; about thirty bunches must, at least, have been thus presented. When Vespers were finished a procession entered by the west door of the chapel, consisting of—1. The crucifer, attended by acolytes bearing torches; 2. cantors in copes; 3. priest in cope; 4. officiating priest in cope and stole, attended by two boys as cope-bearers. These proceeded to the altar, which was quite resplendent with candles and flowers. The Sacred Host was taken out of the Tabernacle and censed, while *O Salutaris* in English was sung; then followed the Litany of our Lord, and hymns and collects in honour of—1. The Blessed Sacrament; 2. The Festival of All Saints; 3. St. Benedict. Ave Maria was then sung, after which the Benediction was given by the priest making the sign of the Cross with the Host over the people, during which "*Tantum ergo*," was sung the bells rang, and clouds of incense descended. All the hymns, &c. were in English, and I may remark that all direct petitions to our Lady and the Saints are rigorously excluded from the offices, though mere salutations are permitted, such as the "*Ave Maria*," for the part commencing *Sancta Maria* is not said; this, all may not be aware, is not found in the old Sarum books.'

We need hardly say that Benediction is among the novelties of Rome's later system, and we trust that we need not add that it is one whose introduction amongst us, except by a subterfuge, is inadmissible. As to its own intrinsic import, we cannot do better than quote what we said exactly fourteen years ago while treating of the tendencies of modern Romanism, when certainly there was nothing which we less anticipated than that we should

have to protest in the *Christian Remembrancer* against an attempt to introduce that rite into the Church of England.

'The Real Presence, *irrespective of the Sacrifice which makes it*, (a development of the idea of Transubstantiation as distinct from the Catholic verity of that awful presence;) a doctrine out of which has grown already the exorbitant importance given to the rite of "Benediction of (or rather by) the Blessed Sacrament;" a rite, the essence of which is the blessing of the flock by bringing forward the Hostia to an increased proximity with them.'—*Christian Remembrancer*, for January, 1851, *Art. Oratorianism and Ecclesiology*.

As an argument *ad hominem*, we cannot refrain from pointing out the great ignorance or inconsistency of Mr. Lyne, who justified his choice of the Benedictine rule at Bristol by its primitive character, thus eking out his ritual with so modern a Roman invention.

The fact of the Deacon Superior taking upon himself to conclude the day's service by giving, from his seat, solemn 'precatory' benedictions not only to the young gentlemen who, like himself, assume the Benedictine disguise, but to all who care to kneel for it, is a noteworthy fact towards forming conclusions as to the *animus* of the entire movement. The gushing visitor believed that he was witnessing a revival of the 'ages of faith' when he beheld a civic magistrate prostrate before Mr. Lyne. We are not familiar with the composition of the Norwich bench, but if the entire corporation were successively to genuflect themselves before the Superior, we should still be compelled to ask, who gave him his authority. One thing we do know, and that is, that if Mr. Lyne finds his prototype in the old Italian Church, he will do so not among the great Benedictines, but among the unscrupulous Franciscans. He calls himself a monk, and he simulates a friar.

Our opposition to Mr. Lyne's chapel doings proceeds from no dissatisfaction at the already established usage of services, external to the Prayer-book, being often employed in the domestic chapels and oratories of private houses, and of institutions religious or charitable. These services, to be admissible, must fulfil five necessary conditions. 1. Their spirit must be that of the Prayer-book. 2. They must honestly be meant for the use of the inmates of the house in which they are held, and not as a substitute for Church services to an outside public. 3. Even to those who use them, they must be subordinate in importance to Church worship. 4. Where they occur in formal establishments, they must be sanctioned or connived at by the same authority which sanctions or connives at the establishment itself. 5. They must strictly be of the lesser order of worship, the celebration of the Eucharist (except in the casual case of a sick communion) being out of the ques-

tion, unless with the express licence of the Ordinary. Mr. Lyne's chapel system flies in the face of every one of these conditions, and so its practical effect, of course, will be to check the timely growth in England, on English principles, of an elastic system of succursal worship.

We do not predict a very long existence for the pseudo-Benedictine brotherhood itself, although we see that its promoters boast that its 'third order' of laity (a graft from Franciscanism, which would have sorely puzzled S. Benedict) boasts several hundred members. If it stood alone accordingly, we should not have spent much time in its dissection; but, unluckily, it is patronized by that section of the clergy who have otherwise made themselves conspicuous for excessive ritual; and in its train, no doubt, other movements, equally unwise, will follow. Their organs boast of an attempt to get up a pro-celibacy league among the clergy, and we know that circulars have been sent round inviting them to join it, and to place themselves under the command of a head who has invested himself with very despotic powers. We leave this fact to tell its own tale. It is therefore due to our credit and consistency—it is due to the hope still existing that we may be able to do some good in our own generation, our own country, and our own Church, in spreading the knowledge of the Christian truth and its saving ordinances—to say, that the feverish extravagance of Norwich Benedictinism and of similar outbursts, is no genuine offshoot of the great Anglican Church Movement.

In contemplating those phenomena we are bound to ask where they are likely to end, and whither they will probably lead their promoters. This question cannot, however, be handled without taking into account yet another phenomenon which we have purposely kept out of consideration hitherto. It is one of higher aims, and worked by a wider circle of men than the pure and simple sensation movement. Still, unfortunately for its own ends, it has certain marked external affinities with that phase of Churchmanship. We mean the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity (an object in itself never to be spoken of without sympathy and approbation). That blessing for which our Lord prayed must ever be the dearest object to the devout Christian. The weak point of the present Association is not that it prays for the peace of Jerusalem, but that it seems to have worked itself into a belief that all probabilities are running in favour of a visible and speedy accomplishment of its own idea of unity in the way which it has forecast for itself, and that it has accordingly shut its eyes to the prodigious practical difficulties environing the notion. The general complexion of the body was, in its more spiritual

aspect, that of an Association, organized in 1857, of members of the English, Roman, and Greek Churches, and numbering, so it is asserted, 17,009 members, bound to unite in certain prayers for unity, with an apparent understanding among the clergy to preach occasionally in aid of the same end. Its mundane machinery was the establishment of a periodical, entitled the *Union Review*, with the double object of being simply a High Church Anglican and Conservative Organ, and also a channel for the communications of the Unionists of all communions. It has been written with considerable cleverness, although its double intention has made it somewhat unworkable. As was natural, a periodical conducted on such principles proved a god-send to a class whose lips were otherwise padlocked, the discontented, or disappointed Roman Catholics—*mauvais coucheurs*—who had lost the *Home and Foreign Review*, and who were sure of being refused admission to the ordinary run either of Romanist or Protestant periodicals. Of communications from such writers the most remarkable was a long paper with the unfortunate and unworthy title of 'Experiences of a Vert' (i.e. convert or pervert) which has, from internal evidence, been publicly and without contradiction, attributed to Mr. Ffoulkes, formerly B.D. and Fellow of Jesus' College, Oxford, author of the 'Counter Theory,' in reply to, though several years later than, Dr. Newman's 'Essay on Development,' and now a married man in lay Roman communion. It is needless for us to epitomise this paper, which has been reproduced at great length in the *Guardian*. Its practical summing up was a 'rehabilitation' of the English Church, and a dissuasion from individual secession. Its publication led to a result for which the Association was strangely unprepared. Hitherto it had gone on in the conviction that 'the Association' has been approved in the highest Ecclesiastical quarters, both 'among Latins, Anglicans, and Greeks. The Holy Father gave his blessing to the scheme when first started, and repeated that blessing with a direct and kindly commendation to one of the English Secretaries who was more recently 'granted the honour of a special interview.' So, too, we are told that the Ex-Patriarch of Constantinople had done the like. This statement regarding the Pope was subsequent to the event which we have to record, and has been confirmed by the Mr. Nugee, who has declared himself the person who heard the Pope so speak. No doubt Pius IX., who is, as all know, both kindly and courteous, not to say gushing in his manners, and thoroughly ignorant of English matters, would be very likely to give his blessing off-hand to a body of which all he knew was that it was an Association to promote Christian Unity.

Indeed, the Encyclic with which the Pope has recently astonished the world is proof positive that he could not have meant anything in particular, or known anything about the Association, when he gave that blessing.

However, the *Vert's* paper changed everything. It is absurd to say that the tone in which he talked of the existing Roman Church, and in particular of its recent English manifestation, was, as might have been expected, uncomplimentary and aggravating, however true in Anglican eyes. To a zealous Roman Catholic his outspoken language might not unreasonably wear an even darker colour, as a deliberate attempt to check the work of God, in the reclamation one by one of individual souls from heresy to the true fold. We cannot therefore much wonder, nor, from their point of view, blame very severely the Roman Court, moved thereto it is said by Dr. Manning, and the Pope as prompted by the Court, for answering Mr. Ffoulkes by a very peremptory condemnation of the whole Association, so far as it was participated in by Roman Catholics, and by placing the *Review* in the Index. It is, perhaps, equally true to nature that the Association cannot see the matter in the same light, and resents the Papal condemnation, although obtained subsequently to the provoking article, as if it were inconsistent with the antecedent blessing, *valeat quantum*.

With all sympathy for the excellent members of the Association, placed as they are in so disagreeable a dilemma, we really think that the embrangement has its value, and may even help the object they have at heart—the visible reunion of Christendom. It is well that they should learn thus early in their career that, short of an immediate, visible, overruling miracle, the task on which they are embarked is, in its merely human aspect, the most perplexingly difficult undertaking in which the human mind ever engaged itself. An association to restore the 'Holy Roman Empire,' would be (we talk of the labour of the work, not of its utility if accomplished) a mere trifle in comparison. The reason is plain; it is an undertaking to the accomplishment of which the highest and the lowest motives alike of people, sects, and classes, are variously and discordantly, yet strongly opposed. One, as the Anglican, the Roman, and the Greek Churches are in their belief in the Creeds, in the possession of Holy Orders, and in the consequent validity of their sacraments; they are in all innumerable secondary matters—to the naked eye in short—quite different bodies, and the satisfactory adjustment of these innumerable secondary matters is an enterprise before whose difficulty the most daring and the most patient might stand appalled. The difficulty is, of course, greatly augmented, when



the body out of which the movement for that adjustment proceeds is the one of the three on which the two others look down, and which is far more different from either than either of them is from the other. If a further surplussage of difficulty be needed, it is found in the fact that within that third body itself exists a large school, who look upon the desire to unite with Rome in any form as sinful, and who must, *pari passu*, be conciliated, unless the 'Unity of Christendom' is to determine in the break-up of the Church of England.

It is hardly possible to believe that a fair poll of the inner intentions with which the various members of the Association accepted their membership, would reveal a joint basis of action, sufficiently stable to stand a really crucial stress. Some good people have, no doubt, joined the body from impulse rather than logic or learning, and would therefore be the more easily frightened or chilled off when it became necessary to reason or to diplomatised. Others may have persuaded themselves that it only needed a little quiet explanation, to induce the 'Patriarchs' of Rome and Constantinople to sit down with the Archbishop of Canterbury, happy in the joint practice of a developed Anglicanism—acceptable alike to the 'Gesu' and to Exeter Hall. Many of the rest, while they uttered 'unity,' muttered under breath, 'Cathedra Petri,' and played with the Association as a machine made to hand wherewith, at the cost perhaps of a few non-essential concessions, to bring a rich fresh harvest into the garner of the Holy Roman Church. Others again looked into the exclusive past and deemed Christianity anchored on the rock of the changeless East. We blame none of these sections: all would be equally sincere from their respective points of view. Before there could be any reasonable hope of bringing Rome to unity, Rome must be brought to think no worse of us than she does of the 'Photian schism' or the 'Armenian heresy.'

But this is not all. Christian unity being the object, how dare we overlook that vast Armenian Church, and the other smaller Eastern episcopal bodies, who (however incomplete their profession of the Catholic faith) ostensibly possess Orders and Sacraments? Yet curiously, the Association seems to ignore them. Furthermore, would it be a satisfactory 'Unity' if there were any large bodies, calling themselves Christians, outside the pale of the visible United Church? Still, we cannot discover that the Association has taken, or intends to take, steps to win co-operation from those millions of Protestants in the British Islands, on the Continent, in America, and in Australia, who, although devoid of the Apostolic succession, believe in, and baptise in the name of, the ever Blessed Trinity. We find this

position unequivocally stated in a Charge, addressed to his annual synod in 1863, by a prelate of whom no Churchman should speak without respect, the Bishop of Brechin, and which is reprinted in the 'Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom,' published by the Association, with a preface by the Secretary, recapitulating its objects: 'nor can a unity be said to be complete ' which does not assimilate with itself all that is good and pious ' in the Protestant bodies.'

But we have wandered from the question which we proposed to ourselves of the probable future of the present extreme school, whose most respectable side is to be found among the members of the Unity Association, and its most sensational manifestations in the make-believe Benedictines of Norwich. Taking all these different manifestations of uneasy acquiescence in the actual Anglican system into consideration, we have to ask ourselves whether these movements are likely to repeat the history of the school of 'extravagantes' represented by Mr. Newman, Mr. Ward, Mr. Oakeley, and Mr. Faber, and, after a course of gradual weaning, fall into the comprehensive embrace of Rome; or will they repeat the second crop of converts matured in 1851, and more abruptly lost to us from purely doctrinal causes in consequence of a single defeat? We do not think so. If we gave as our first reason that the wind had turned, and the fashion of Romeward conversions had died down, we might be taxed with implying, in guarded words, that there was some lack of power or real originality in the leaders of this section, and that they were more prone to be influenced by than to lead a popular fashion. Even if we did mean what might be thus put in our mouths, we should not on that account be arraigning the ability or the sincerity of the school we have been speaking of, or their excellent intentions.

Assuming, then, a latitudinarian bias to be the theological vice of this quarter of a century, as a Roman one was of that which closed in 1850, we believe that the excesses of this school will take the colour of their own generation. We think we hear some of our readers exclaim, Latitudinarianism! what Latitudinarianism can lurk in the proceedings of men who model their observances according to the rubrics of the Union Review Almanack? Mr. Lyne's proceedings would be a sufficient answer to the question, but perhaps it is better to explain our meaning more fully. The present *régime* in London tends very much to a general permission to everybody to do what he likes, provided he is, or says that he is, active; and London gives the cue to England more than England would like to admit. The party, if not Roman, is assuredly not Anglican in

its feelings and interests. There are two futures before them. On the one side is, of course, the risk of a popular riot, from which those who are labouring for the restoration of genuine English ritual, and who recollect the terrible autumn of 1850, will be certain to emerge sufferers. If this is happily avoided, this party, secure in the immunity of a latitudinarian régime, will shrink within itself into a *Petite Eglise*—each clergyman satisfied in the maintenance of his own congregation, and each a material hostage for some corresponding divarication on the deficient or ultra-Protestant side by some other loose-sitting incumbent. And in this way single, and as it were private, churches will be pointed to and marked off, and each will not improbably be a check to the healthy development of ritual in some twenty others. If inhibitions come to trouble the calm of the scene, the example of the wandering deacon playing at abbot in the streets of Norwich will furnish a dangerous precedent for indiscriminate disobedience.

Still the problem of the Unity of Christendom will rest unsolved. Will visible unity ever be again vouchsafed this side of the Day of Judgment? Prayers and hopes say, yes. Reason says that the idea is a pious aspiration, not a stable assurance. The basis of the Anglican theory, the possibility of intrinsic oneness without visible unity, is a doctrine which is not measured by centuries; either it may hold good to the end, or it cannot have held good up till now. If the Sacraments are the same lifegiving ordinances wherever they are duly administered, we may conceive the number of God's elect being accomplished age after age, and yet the ages debating, as they now do, in the various branches of Christ's Church. But if in God's counsels ultimate unity is decreed while the world is still in its actual attitude of expectation, we might almost dare to say, *pax paritur bello*. Many debates—general disintegration—man's wickedness working as much as man's religion—country against country, diocese against diocese—must, short of a miracle, be the state of the Christian world before the huge inert masses can be sufficiently broken up to admit of the freed atoms being reunited as a homogeneous whole. Again, when the Churches which now own the Apostolic ministry are fused together, what will be the condition of the Protestant communities all over the world? While striving to magnify the wisdom and mercy of God by scheming to reunite the Roman, Greek, and Anglican communions, are we to refuse to bestow a thought on the future of those huge bodies of Christians? Who will dare to call that 'unity' which would leave those, by that time ancient, communities of baptized men—men working out their own salvation with the scant aid of vacant rites—out in the cold night, punished

for the sins of their remote ancestors, cut off for evermore from the visible fold of the Catholic Church?

In the meanwhile, as the first and foremost of personal duties, as the simplest and therefore the most efficacious of contributions towards unity, let us quit ourselves like men in that Church in which our own lot has been cast, working out its system in doctrine, in ritual, and in practical usefulness, according to the exemplar of that Prayer-book which, until we become very much better than we ever have been, is likely to continue a sufficient guide to lead us through our present difficulties to the quiet land of everlasting peace.

## NOTICES.

EVEN a slight acquaintance with the rationalistic literature of our day, must convince all thoughtful men that the Holy Gospels will soon become one of the main objects of attack. Not only from pens avowedly hostile to the Christology of the Catholic Church, but even from quarters where friendship is proclaimed, there proceeds a murmur of more or less dissatisfaction and doubt. One of these utterances, in *Fraser's Magazine*, for January, 1864, has called forth a pamphlet, entitled 'Modern Scepticism,' from a writer of distinguished academical reputation, Mr. Gregory Smith, of Tedstone-Delamere. Mr. G. Smith's pamphlet is marked throughout by great candour, and displays much insight into the mind of modern free-thinking and the real nature of the questions at issue. The style is finished and scholarly, and often suggests even more than it openly expresses. Where so much has been done, it may seem ungracious to ask for more. Yet we cannot help expressing a hope that the author of this really valuable production may one day pursue the subject, and enter into still further details upon some of the points mooted by the critic in *Fraser's Magazine*. We must not, however, omit to mention that Mr. G. Smith has already added to his *brochure* an excellent little epitome of the life of Christ, based in the main upon the arrangement made by Bishop Ellicott in his Hulsean Lectures. It will prove useful to teachers, and may well form an introduction to larger works.

We have frequently had occasion to commend Mrs. Gatty's admirable 'Parables from Nature.' Messrs. Bell and Daldy have collected the four series into a volume, which has been illustrated by first-rate artists. Whether we look at the paper, type, plates, or matter, the work leaves nothing to be desired. It is one of the most original, instructive, and beautiful books we are acquainted with in that department of literature, and is equally appropriate to the school-room, the drawing-room, and the library.

M. Emile de Bonnechose's 'History of France' is too highly appreciated wherever the French language is known to need any recommendation. Many of our readers may, however, be glad to know of the appearance of a thirteenth edition, in two volumes, 8vo. (Paris: Firmin Didot). This edition is greatly enlarged, and contains, among other additions, a thoughtful and remarkable Preface, as well as a lengthy and impartial account of the reign of Louis Philippe. During the last twenty years many Histories of France, more or less meritorious, have been published; but M. de Bonnechose's stands decidedly first and best. Few French

historians write with the same patience of investigation, the same calm philosophical impartiality, or the same regard for truth as M. de Bonnechose ; and, let us add, still fewer are animated with the same kind and generous feelings towards this country.

Dr. Godfray edits for the Anglo-Continental Society, with his wonted care and accuracy, the correspondence which took place between Archbishop Wake and Dupin, on the scheme of union between the Anglican and Gallican Churches, which was discussed by them. Together with the Letters, an historical *resumé* of the subject is given, which is interesting and instructive. In the Appendix, the Thirty-Nine Articles, which were commented on and criticised one by one, by the Doctors of the Sorbonne are given at full length in French. A short preface introduces the pamphlet, a great part of which has already appeared in the pages of the *Union Chrétienne*. The title is, 'Projet d'Union entre les Eglises Gallicane et Anglicane' (Rivingtons).—Three other Italian publications have been brought out by the Anglo-Continental Society during the past year—(1.) a short and somewhat insignificant tract on 'Order in the Church,' from an unpublished manuscript of the late Rev. George May ; (2.) a very valuable chapter, extracted from 'Allix's Churches of Piedmont,' in which the author proves the independence of the Church of North Italy, and its freedom from all, even canonical, subservience to Rome for the first thousand years of its existence ; and (3.) 'Ten Letters to a Statesman on the Affairs of the Church in Italy, by Five Ecclesiastics.' The Statesman to whom the Letters were originally addressed is, we believe, Sir James Hudson.

---

NOTE.—We are requested to observe in connexion with our article on the Irish Church (Christian Remembrancer, No. CXXV.) that the statement is incorrect that there are 200 ecclesiastical sinecures in Ireland. There are not a dozen. This error, for which our contributor is not responsible, has arisen from a mistake connected with *united* parishes, which has been long and widely circulated. There is daily service in St. Colomba's College, Limerick ; Christ Church, Dublin ; Armagh Cathedral ; St. Anne's, Grangegorman, St. Peter's and St. Stephen's, Dublin. There is weekly communion at St. Nicholas, Cork ; St. Nicholas, St. Anne's (for the past year) ; St. Peter's, Rathmenes ; Molyneux Asylum Chapel, and Bray, in the archdiocese of Dublin, in addition to those mentioned at p. 35. In the case of some of the sinecures, a suspension will take place when they are next vacated.